1	IN '	THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT CO	Page 1	1		I N D E X (continued)	Page 3
	FOR	THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSO	DURI	2		EXHIBITS (continued)	
2		EASTERN DIVISION		3	Exhibit 57	Dr. Wagner's Report	150
3				4	Exhibit 58	E-mail	174
4	KATARZYNA FO	ULGER, et al.,		5	Exhibit 59	Weekly QC Review	175
5	Plaint			6	Exhibit 60	3/10/21 CAP Letter	189
6	vs.		No. 4:22-CV-00878	7	Exhibit 61	3/17/21 Averhealth Letter	189
7			NO. 4.22-CV-00676	8	Exhibit 62	5/13/21 CAP Letter	194
	•	AVERTEST, LLC d/b/a AVERHEALTH,			Exhibit 63	Summation Report	200
8	Defend	ant.		10	Exhibit 64	Deficiency Response Sheet	201
9				11	Exhibit 65	E-mail	219
10				12	Exhibit 66	6/17/21 CAP Letter	225
11				13	Exhibit 67	5/25/21 CAP Letter	226
12				14	Exhibit 68	7/29/21 CAP Letter	230
13				15	Exhibit 69	Slide Deck	234
14				16	Exhibit 70	Averhealth Response to	254
15		VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION OF	?	10	EXHIBIC 70	Vice News Article	234
		DOMINIQUE DELAGNES		17		.100 Memb Nicitie	
16		JULY 9, 2024		*	Exhibit 71	3/21/23 Annual Performance	259
17				18	DANIENTO /I	Review	200
18				19	(Original co		ained hy the
19				1	(Original exhibits 45 through 71 were retained by the reporter and copies will be provided as requested.)		
20				20	reporter and	copies will be provided as re	equesteu.)
21				21			
22				22			
23				23			
24				24			
25				25			
23				25			
				1			
			Page 2				Page 4
1 2		I N D E X WITNESSES	Page 2	1		THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COU	URT
2 3	All Witnesse	WITNESSES s:	Page 2	1		THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COU	URT
2	Dominique De	WITNESSES s: lagnes	Page	1 2			URT
2 3	Dominique De Examination	WITNESSES s:	Page 7 272			THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON	URT
2 3 4	Dominique De Examination Examination	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld	Page	2	FOR	THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON	URT
2 3 4	Dominique De Examination Examination	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas	Page 7 272	2 3	FOR	THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al.,	URT
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam Exhibit 28	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum	Page 7 272 278	2 3 4	FOR KATARZYNA FO	THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al.,	URT
2 3 4 5 6 7	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS	Page 7 272 278	2 3 4 5	FOR KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs.	THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al.,	URI
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn	Page 7 272 278 15 44	2 3 4 5 6	FOR KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs.	THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No	URI
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam Exhibit 28	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by	Page 7 272 278	2 3 4 5 6	FOR KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL	THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No	URI
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn	Page 7 272 278 15 44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	FOR KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL	THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No	URI URI D. 4:22-CV-00878
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	FOR KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend	THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No. C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, ant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION	URI D. 4:22-CV-00878 OF DOMINIQUE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No. C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, sant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined on	URI D. 4:22-CV-00878 OF DOMINIQUE In July 9,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, between	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION UUGER, et al., iffs, Case No C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, ant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined on n the hours of eight o'clock	URI D. 4:22-CV-00878 OF DOMINIQUE In July 9, in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, between	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No. C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, sant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined on	URI D. 4:22-CV-00878 OF DOMINIQUE In July 9, in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40 Exhibit 45 Exhibit 45	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court 11/19/20 Letter 12/17/20 CAP Letter	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96 9 33	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	FOR KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, betwee forenoon and	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION UUGER, et al., iffs, Case No C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, ant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined on n the hours of eight o'clock	OF DOMINIQUE n July 9, in the of that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40 Exhibit 45	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court 11/19/20 Letter	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, betwee forenoon and day, at the	THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No. C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, ant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined or n the hours of eight o'clock : six o'clock in the afternoon	OF DOMINIQUE In July 9, in the of that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40 Exhibit 45 Exhibit 45	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court 11/19/20 Letter 12/17/20 CAP Letter	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96 9 33	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, betwee forenoon and day, at the Forsyth Boul	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No. C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, ant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined or n the hours of eight o'clock is six o'clock in the afternoon office of Armstrong Teasdale,	OF DOMINIQUE In July 9, in the of that 7700 efore
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40 Exhibit 45 Exhibit 45 Exhibit 46	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court 11/19/20 Letter 12/17/20 CAP Letter	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96 9 33 36	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, betwee forenoon and day, at the Forsyth Boul Tammie A. He	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No. C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, ant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined or n the hours of eight o'clock : six o'clock in the afternoon office of Armstrong Teasdale, evard, St. Louis, Missouri, be	OF DOMINIQUE in July 9, in the of that 7700 efore Reporter,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40 Exhibit 45 Exhibit 45 Exhibit 46 Exhibit 47 Exhibit 48 Exhibit 49	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court 11/19/20 Letter 12/17/20 CAP Letter 12/22/20 CAP Letter 1/29/21 CAP Letter Teams Chat Messages	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96 9 33 36 61 66	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, betwee forenoon and day, at the Forsyth Boul Tammie A. He Certified Sh	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, ant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined of n the hours of eight o'clock in six o'clock in the afternoon office of Armstrong Teasdale, evard, St. Louis, Missouri, be et, a Registered Professional	OF DOMINIQUE in July 9, in the of that 7700 efore Reporter, ublic
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Examination Further Examination Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40 Exhibit 46 Exhibit 46 Exhibit 47 Exhibit 48	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court 11/19/20 Letter 12/17/20 CAP Letter 12/22/20 CAP Letter	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96 9 33 36 61	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, betwee forenoon and day, at the Forsyth Boul Tammie A. He Certified Sh within and f	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No. C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, ant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined or n the hours of eight o'clock is six o'clock in the afternoon office of Armstrong Teasdale, evard, St. Louis, Missouri, be et, a Registered Professional orthand Reporter and Notary Po	OF DOMINIQUE in July 9, in the of that 7700 efore Reporter, ublic Missouri,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Exam Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40 Exhibit 45 Exhibit 45 Exhibit 46 Exhibit 47 Exhibit 48 Exhibit 49	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court 11/19/20 Letter 12/17/20 CAP Letter 12/22/20 CAP Letter 1/29/21 CAP Letter Teams Chat Messages	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96 9 33 36 61 66	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, betwee forenoon and day, at the Forsyth Boul Tammie A. He Certified Sh within and f in a certain	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No. C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, ant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined on n the hours of eight o'clock in six o'clock in the afternoon office of Armstrong Teasdale, evard, St. Louis, Missouri, be et, a Registered Professional orthand Reporter and Notary Po or the states of Illinois and cause now pending before the	OF DOMINIQUE In July 9, in the of that 7700 efore Reporter, ublic Missouri, United
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Examination Further Examination Further Examination Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40 Exhibit 45 Exhibit 46 Exhibit 47 Exhibit 48 Exhibit 49 Exhibit 50 Exhibit 51	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court 11/19/20 Letter 12/17/20 CAP Letter 12/22/20 CAP Letter 1/29/21 CAP Letter Teams Chat Messages Excerpt of Transcript 2/25/21 Averhealth Letter	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96 9 33 36 61 66 76 91	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, betwee forenoon and day, at the Forsyth Boul Tammie A. He Certified Sh within and f in a certain States Distr	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No. C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, ant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined or n the hours of eight o'clock is six o'clock in the afternoon office of Armstrong Teasdale, evard, St. Louis, Missouri, be et, a Registered Professional orthand Reporter and Notary Poor or the states of Illinois and cause now pending before the ict Court for the Eastern Dist	OF DOMINIQUE n July 9, in the of that 7700 efore Reporter, ublic Missouri, United trict of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Examination Further Examination Further Examination Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40 Exhibit 46 Exhibit 45 Exhibit 47 Exhibit 48 Exhibit 49 Exhibit 50	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court 11/19/20 Letter 12/17/20 CAP Letter 12/22/20 CAP Letter 1/29/21 CAP Letter Teams Chat Messages Excerpt of Transcript	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96 9 33 36 61 66 76	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, betwee forenoon and day, at the Forsyth Boul Tammie A. He Certified Sh within and f in a certain States Distr Missouri, Ea	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No. C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, sant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined or n the hours of eight o'clock: six o'clock in the afternoon office of Armstrong Teasdale, evard, St. Louis, Missouri, be et, a Registered Professional orthand Reporter and Notary Po for the states of Illinois and cause now pending before the ict Court for the Eastern Dist stern Division in re: Katarzyn	OF DOMINIQUE In July 9, in the of that 7700 efore Reporter, ublic Missouri, United trict of na Foulger,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Examination Further Examination Further Examination Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40 Exhibit 45 Exhibit 46 Exhibit 47 Exhibit 48 Exhibit 49 Exhibit 50 Exhibit 51	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court 11/19/20 Letter 12/17/20 CAP Letter 12/22/20 CAP Letter 1/29/21 CAP Letter Teams Chat Messages Excerpt of Transcript 2/25/21 Averhealth Letter	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96 9 33 36 61 66 76 91	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, betwee forenoon and day, at the Forsyth Boul Tammie A. He Certified Sh within and f in a certain States Distr Missouri, Ea et al. vs. A	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No. C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, ant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined or n the hours of eight o'clock: six o'clock in the afternoon office of Armstrong Teasdale, evard, St. Louis, Missouri, be et, a Registered Professional orthand Reporter and Notary Po or the states of Illinois and cause now pending before the ict Court for the Eastern Dist stern Division in re: Katarzy, vertest, LLC d/b/a Averhealth,	OF DOMINIQUE In July 9, in the of that 7700 efore Reporter, ublic Missouri, United trict of na Foulger,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Examination Further Examination Further Examination Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40 Exhibit 45 Exhibit 46 Exhibit 47 Exhibit 48 Exhibit 49 Exhibit 50 Exhibit 51 Exhibit 52	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court 11/19/20 Letter 12/17/20 CAP Letter 12/22/20 CAP Letter 1/29/21 CAP Letter Teams Chat Messages Excerpt of Transcript 2/25/21 Averhealth Letter	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96 9 33 36 61 66 76 91	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, betwee forenoon and day, at the Forsyth Boul Tammie A. He Certified Sh within and f in a certain States Distr Missouri, Ea	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No. C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, ant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined or n the hours of eight o'clock: six o'clock in the afternoon office of Armstrong Teasdale, evard, St. Louis, Missouri, be et, a Registered Professional orthand Reporter and Notary Po or the states of Illinois and cause now pending before the ict Court for the Eastern Dist stern Division in re: Katarzy, vertest, LLC d/b/a Averhealth,	OF DOMINIQUE In July 9, in the of that 7700 efore Reporter, ublic Missouri, United trict of na Foulger,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Examination Further Examination Further Examination Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40 Exhibit 45 Exhibit 45 Exhibit 47 Exhibit 48 Exhibit 49 Exhibit 50 Exhibit 51 Exhibit 52 Exhibit 53	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court 11/19/20 Letter 12/17/20 CAP Letter 12/22/20 CAP Letter 1/29/21 CAP Letter Teams Chat Messages Excerpt of Transcript 2/25/21 Averhealth Letter 2/26/21 Averhealth Letter E-mail Michigan Prosecutor's Association Slide Deck	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96 9 33 36 61 66 76 91 94 103	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, betwee forenoon and day, at the Forsyth Boul Tammie A. He Certified Sh within and f in a certain States Distr Missouri, Ea et al. vs. A	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No. C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, ant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined or n the hours of eight o'clock: six o'clock in the afternoon office of Armstrong Teasdale, evard, St. Louis, Missouri, be et, a Registered Professional orthand Reporter and Notary Po or the states of Illinois and cause now pending before the ict Court for the Eastern Dist stern Division in re: Katarzy, vertest, LLC d/b/a Averhealth,	OF DOMINIQUE In July 9, in the of that 7700 efore Reporter, ublic Missouri, United trict of na Foulger,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Dominique De Examination Examination Further Examination Further Examination Further Examination Exhibit 28 Exhibit 29 Exhibit 31 Exhibit 39 Exhibit 40 Exhibit 46 Exhibit 47 Exhibit 47 Exhibit 48 Exhibit 49 Exhibit 50 Exhibit 51 Exhibit 52 Exhibit 53	WITNESSES s: lagnes by Mr. Cornfeld by Mr. Cejas mination by Mr. Cornfeld EXHIBITS Memorandum 1/4/21 Letter authored by Michele Glinn E-mail 11/11/20 Letter Memo to Supreme Court 11/19/20 Letter 12/17/20 CAP Letter 12/22/20 CAP Letter 1/29/21 CAP Letter Teams Chat Messages Excerpt of Transcript 2/25/21 Averhealth Letter 2/26/21 Averhealth Letter E-mail Michigan Prosecutor's	Page 7 272 278 15 44 24 61 96 9 33 36 61 66 76 91 94	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	KATARZYNA FO Plaint vs. AVERTEST, LL Defend DELAGNES, pr 2024, betwee forenoon and day, at the Forsyth Boul Tammie A. He Certified Sh within and f in a certain States Distr Missouri, Ea et al. vs. A	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSON EASTERN DIVISION ULGER, et al., iffs, Case No. C d/b/a AVERHEALTH, ant. VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION oduced, sworn, and examined or n the hours of eight o'clock: six o'clock in the afternoon office of Armstrong Teasdale, evard, St. Louis, Missouri, be et, a Registered Professional orthand Reporter and Notary Po or the states of Illinois and cause now pending before the ict Court for the Eastern Dist stern Division in re: Katarzy, vertest, LLC d/b/a Averhealth,	OF DOMINIQUE In July 9, in the of that 7700 efore Reporter, ublic Missouri, United trict of na Foulger,



Dominique Delagnes July 09, 2024 Page 5 Page 7 APPEARANCES Plaintiffs. 2 2 MR. CEJAS: Nick Cejas on behalf of For the Plaintiffs: 4 Mr. Richard S. Cornfeld, Esq. 3 the defendant. GOLDENBERG HELLER ANTOGNOLI, PC 4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Would the court 5 2227 South State Route 157 Edwardsville, Illinois 62025 5 reporter please swear in the witness and we may 618/656-5150 6 6 proceed. rick@ghalaw.com 7 AND 8 8 DOMINIQUE DELAGNES. Mr. J.C. Pleban, Esq. 9 of lawful age, produced, sworn, and examined on 9 PLEBAN & ASSOCIATES LAW 2010 South Big Bend Boulevard behalf of Plaintiffs, deposes and says: 10 10 St. Louis, Missouri 63117 11 **EXAMINATION** 314/645-6666 11 jc@plebanlaw.com QUESTIONS BY MR. CORNFELD: 12 12 13 Would you state your name, please, 13 For the Defendant: 14 Mr. Nicholas P. Cejas, Esq. 14 ma'am? ARMSTRONG TEASDALE, LLP 15 My name is Dominique Delagnes. 1.5 7700 Forsyth Boulevard, Suite 1800 St. Louis, Missouri 63105 16 And what is your business or 16 314/342-8040 17 occupation? ncejas@atllp.com 18 What is my occupation? 18 Reported/Video-Recorded By: 19 19 20 I'm the chief operating officer at Ms. Tammie A. Heet, RPR, CSR(IL), CCR(MO) 20 Mr. David Doell, Legal Videographer 21 Averhealth. LEXITAS LEGAL 22 You said chief operating officer? 21 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 23 Sorry. I'm the chief executive 22 314/644-2191 24 officer. I was promoted several months ago and 23 2.4 still getting used to the new title. Chief 25 Page 6 Page 8 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by executive officer. 1 and between counsel for the Plaintiffs and counsel 2 You became the CEO in May, correct? 3 for the Defendant that this deposition may be taken 3 Correct. in shorthand by Tammie A. Heet, RPR, CSR, CCR and 4 May of 2024? notary public, and afterwards transcribed into 5 And before that, you were the chief printing, and signature by the witness expressly 6 operating officer? 7 reserved. 7 Α. That is correct. 8 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now on the 8 Since 2014? O. record. Today's date is July the 9th, 2024. The 9 Correct. 10 time is approximately 8:44 a.m. Central Standard 10 Q. All right. What is your business or 11 Time. This begins the video-recorded deposition of occupation? 11 Dominique Delagnes in the matter of Foulger v. 12 Α. Our business --Avertest, Case Number 4:22-CV-00878 in the United 13 Q. I'm sorry, what is -- what is your 14 States District Court for the Eastern District of 14 address? 15 Missouri 15 My -- my address for what? Α. 16 This deposition is being held at the 16 What is your work address? 17 law offices of Armstrong Teasdale. The reporter's 17 For where the laboratory works or name is Tammie Heet. My name is David Doell and 18 where I personally work? 19 I'm the legal videographer. We are here with 19 Your -- your address. 20 Lexitas. 20 I work at -- in our corporate office 21 Would the attorneys attending please 21 in Richmond, Virginia. 22 introduce yourselves and the parties you represent? 22 And what is the address of the 23 MR. CORNFELD: Rick Cornfeld corporate office? 23



A. It's 2916 West Marshall Street,

Suite 100, Richmond, Virginia 23230.

24

24

25

representing the plaintiffs.

MR. PLEBAN: J.C. Pleban for

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 3 of 111 PageID July 09, 2024

Dominique Delagnes Page 9 Q. All right. I apologize in advance 2 for this question, but most lawyers ask this of 2

every witness. How old a lady are you? 3

A. I am -- how old am I? I'm 55.

5 Q. Okay. You understand that you are

here as a witness on your own behalf? 6

7 A. Yes.

4

8 Q. Yesterday, you were testifying as a

corporate designee for Averhealth? 9

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. All right. And that deposition was

12 concluded subject to some things that we're leaving

13 it open for, but this is your deposition of

yourself, of course things you know as the CEO and 14

15 former COO of Averhealth would be something that

16 you would be able to testify about, correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. All right. You -- you have in front

19 of you Exhibit 45, which is a letter on the

letterhead of Averhealth to the Investigations 20

21 Department of the CAP Accreditation Department of

22 the College of American Pathologists dated

23 November 18th, 2020, and signed by Michelle Glinn,

24 PhD, correct?

25 A. Correct.

Page 10

1 Are you familiar with this letter?

2 Α. Yes.

3 This was sent -- and yesterday, we

went over a letter CAP sent to Averhealth on 4

5 November 11th, 2020.

6 Do you recall that?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. All right. And this -- this is a

9 letter that Dr. Glinn sent on behalf of Averhealth

10 in response to that letter, correct?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. And I won't go back over questions

13 that we covered yesterday about what CAP is. You

14 know, I -- that's -- you testified about that and

15 we don't need to repeat that.

16 Do you see that in the second

17 paragraph, Dr. Glinn states on Exhibit 45: We

fully embrace transparency and self-report our 18

19 mistakes, identify the root cause, and take action

20 to prevent future occurrences.

21 Do you see that?

22 A. I do.

23 And is that a true statement, that

24 Averhealth fully embraces transparency?

25 Yes. Α.

Q. Dr. Glinn goes on in the -- at the

end of the second paragraph and says: Averhealth

is committed to accurate test results and helping

to reclaim lives, unite families, and strengthen

communities by helping to overcome substance use 5

6 disorders.

7

8

9

11

13

15

16

Do you see that?

Α. Is that on the second page?

No, in the -- in the second

10 paragraph.

A. Oh, end of the second paragraph.

This paragraph. Yes, I see that. 12

Q. What does Averhealth do to reclaim

14 lives, unite families, or strengthen communities?

Α. We provide accurate drug test results.

17 Q. What do you do to help people

overcome substance use disorders? 18

19 A. By providing accurate test results

20 that gives the information back to treatment

21 courts, to probation departments, and to -- and

other judicial entities so they know the

23 appropriate action to help someone overcome their

24 substance use.

25 Q. So you don't offer people who are

Page 12

Page 11

1 tested, such as my clients, any therapy or any kind

2 of treatment, correct?

3 We do not provide treatment, no. Δ.

4 Q. Or refer them to someone who might do

5 that?

6 Α. We do not.

Did -- all you did was test their 7

8 hair or their oral samples and report the results

9 you said you had, correct?

10 A. And there's also times, especially in

11 treatment court settings, that our team

participates in -- during that process, while

somebody is in a treatment court, there are

meetings with the entire care team, which includes

the treatment provider, us as Averhealth, the

16 judge, and the probation officer or caseworker. So

17 we participate in those and provide information

about drug testing in those settings. 18

Q. And your participation in such 19

settings is limited to providing your drug testing 21 results and saying that those were accurate,

22 correct?

20

23 A. Correct.

24 All right. And then in the letter,

25 you -- if you look down at the paragraph at the



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 4 of 111 PageID

#: Dponipique Delagnes

5

6

gnes July 09, 2024
Page 15

- 1 bottom of the first page of Exhibit 45, carrying
- 2 over to the top of the second page, you spend a
- 3 paragraph -- or Averhealth, Dr. Riley, spends a
- 4 paragraph maligning -- excuse me, Dr. Glinn -- let
- 5 me start over.
- 6 In the paragraph at the bottom of the
- 7 first page of 45 that carries over onto the second
- B page, a pretty long paragraph, Dr. Glinn, on behalf
- 9 of Averhealth, spends that paragraph maligning
- 10 Dr. Riley, correct?
- 11 A. No.
- 12 Q. Well, she says: The complainant
- 13 never fully engaged in the role.
- 14 A. Yes. It does say that.
- 15 Q. All right. You don't think that's
- 16 maligning her?
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. Okay. She failed to gain a full
- 19 understanding of the SOPs or complete the job
- 20 duties assigned to her.
- 21 Do you see that?
- 22 A. I do.

1

2

- Q. That's not maligning her?
- 24 A. That's an accurate statement.
- Q. It's not maligning her?

- 1 believed she was failing to complete many duties
- 2 described in the laboratory director job
- 3 description?
- 4 A. I did not.
 - Q. Why not?
 - A. She had been there for only seven
- 7 weeks. And after she did abruptly leave, I learned
- 8 that she was not on site like she had committed to
- 9 do so, I learned through information in the
- 10 database that she only spent less than 10 hours
- 11 through her entire time frame actually in our LAS
- 12 system looking at information.
- 13 And then as we responded to this
- 14 record, we learned that although -- in -- I -- let
- 15 me find the exhibit, where it was clearly that she
- 16 was supposed to do these weekly reviews, which is
- 17 outlined in here, you had provided a document that
- 18 showed a meeting between Dr. Glinn, Dr. Riley, and
- 19 myself where we outlined job duties. It is
- 20 Exhibit Number 28. And on that exhibit, it clearly
- 21 states that she should be doing the weekly quality
- 22 controls, and we learned in submitting this back to
- 23 CAP that it wasn't done when she was in that role.
- Q. Those were -- those duties were stablished the day before she started at

Page 14

- A. It's an accurate statement that she didn't fulfill her responsibilities.
- 3 Q. And you say: In fact, the
- 4 complainant failed -- or Dr. Glinn says on behalf
- 5 of Averhealth: The complainant failed to complete
- 6 many duties described in the laboratory director
- 7 job description, such as weekly quality control
- 8 reviews and proficiency test result review and
- 9 submission.
- 10 Do you see that?
- 11 A. I do.
- 12 Q. And you don't consider that to be
- 13 maligning her?
- 14 A. It's an accurate statement that she
- 15 didn't fulfill that.
- 16 Q. This accurate statement, Dr. Riley
- 17 reported to you, did she not?
- 18 A. She did.
- 19 Q. Did you ever reprimand her?
- 20 A. Not in the seven weeks, no.
- 21 Q. Did you ever tell her, "You need to
- 22 do a better job to complete the job duties assigned
- 23 to you"?
- 24 A. I did not.
- 25 Q. Did you ever tell her that you

- 1 Averhealth, correct?
- 2 A. I believe that they were in a onsite
- 3 meeting that we had that -- that they were duties
- 4 that were established, yes.
- 5 Q. On September 13th?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Of 2020?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Dr. Riley reported to you. Did you
- 10 monitor her during that time to make sure or to see
- 11 whether she was fulfilling the responsibilities
- 12 that she was supposed to be fulfilling?
- 13 A. I did not look to see that she was
- 14 doing these, no. I did not look to see that she
- 15 had actually completed the weekly quality reviews.
- 16 Q. Or anything else, that she was only
- 17 there 10 hours a week, that there were other job
- 18 responsibilities you say she wasn't fulfilling.
- 19 Did you monitor during that time to see that?
- 20 A. It was also clear in the e-mail that
- 21 she sent me that -- the one where she -- that
- 22 indicated that she came back, that I had to show,
- 23 hey, you did not release those test results like
- 24 you said that you would. It was a
- 25 dextromethorphan. Let me find that document.



Domigique Delagnes

2

3

Page 17

Page: 5 of 111 PageID July 09, 2024 was the -- pretty much the opposite of a reprimand, It was encouraging her as a new employee to the organization. I wouldn't say that welcoming of a new member of the leadership team. After a two-day meeting that he had

Q. Okay.

2 A. In that e-mail, it shows a lack of 3 understanding. She writes: I did not --

4 Q. My -- my -- that's not my question.

5 My question --

A. You're asking if I reprimanded --6

7 No, my --

8 -- in my response here, I --

No, my question is: Did you monitor? 9

10 That -- the letter you're talking about, the e-mail

you're talking about was after she resigned. 11

During her time as an employee of Averhealth and 12

working for Averhealth, did you monitor her as your

direct report to see whether she was fulfilling the

15 responsibility she was supposed to be fulfilling?

16 A. We had weekly conversations, weekly

17 meetings, which one of the ones that we talked

about was the day that she abruptly resigned, to go 18

19 through and for her to ask -- for her to ask me any

20 questions and to provide assistance.

21 My question is --

22 A. Yes, I monitored her for that.

23 And -- and never once reprimanded her

24 or even encouraged her to say "You need to be doing

25 a better job," correct?

it was the opposite of a reprimand. It was a 5

6

7 Q.

8 with her?

wasn't it?

Α.

9 Uh-huh. Α.

10 Q. Yes?

11 Δ Yes.

12 And that you had with her? O.

13 Α. Yes.

14 Q. And nobody at that meeting said,

15 "Hey, Dr. Riley, you're not fulfilling your job

16 responsibilities. You need do to do a better job."

17 Nobody told her that, did they?

18 A. No.

19 Look at the -- the sentence on the

20 bottom of the first page. Before you looked at

that yesterday, you told us that Dr. Riley was a 21

22 part-time employee, correct?

A. Correct.

24 If you look at the bottom of the Q.

first page, Dr. Glinn states: As described in the

Page 18

23

1 A. Of course I've always encouraged 2 people to do the best job that they can.

3 Okay. But you never reprimanded

her --4

5 And I provided support to her as

6 she -- as she asked for it.

7 You never --

8 A. You are right, I never reprimanded

9 her in the seven weeks.

10 Q. Okay. And, in fact, we saw yesterday

11 the e-mail that your boss, Jason Herzog, the CEO of

12 the company, sent to her at the end of October --

13 A. Uh-huh.

14 Q. -- a very encouraging e-mail saying

15 he was happy that she was there --

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. -- correct?

Correct. 18

19 Kind of the opposite of a reprimand,

20 wouldn't you say?

21 A. She was new to the organization and

he was welcoming her. 22

23 She -- she had been there six weeks

24 during a time that you now say she wasn't

25 fulfilling her job responsibilities, but his e-mail job description, the laboratory director is a

2 full-time, on-site role.

Do you see that? 3

4 A. I do.

5 That's not a true statement, is it? O

6 Α. That is not -- yes, she was hired

7 part-time.

8 Q. Did you review this before it was

9 sent?

10 I believe I did, yes.

11 And you let her say -- you let

Dr. Glinn make a false statement about Dr. Riley's

13 role?

14 A. I did not let her make a false

15 statement. I'm sure it was an oversight on my part

16 in here.

Not an administrative error, I would 17 Q.

18 suspect, correct?

19 Α. An oversight.

20 Okay. Dr. Glinn knew that Dr. Riley

21 was not a full-time employee, correct?

22 A. Correct.

23 If you would look at page 17088, this

is one of a number of questions that CAP asked 24

25 Averhealth to answer, correct?



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 6 of 111 PageID July 09, 2024 **Dominique** Delagnes Page 21 Page 23 1 A. Yes. 1 Why didn't you tell CAP that? 2 2 And the question is: During the last Α. And in fact, she did actually

5 A. Which number is it?

6 Q. Number 8.

3

4

'20 --

7 A. Thank you.

8 Q. Okay. You see that question 8 says:

9 During the last ten months, which would be since

ten months -- which would mean since January of

10 January of 2020, correct?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. Has the laboratory received any

13 concerns regarding the quality from employees,

14 patients, and/or providers? If yes, provide a

15 detailed summary of each concern, how the

16 summary -- how the concern was investigated and

17 resolved.

18 Do you see that question?

19 A. I do.

20 Q. And then if you go over to the last

21 paragraph of the answer, which is on page 17089, do

22 you see that you state: On Saturday, November 1,

23 2020, the complainant via e-mail recommended for

24 continuous improvements?

25 A. I do.

1

Q. The question was -- the question that

2 CAP asked was whether anybody expressed any

3 concerns, correct?

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. This paragraph talking about the

6 complainant, meaning Dr. Riley, doesn't mention her

7 concerns. It just mentions that she recommended

8 improvements, correct?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. Why didn't you admit that she had

11 concerns, that Dr. Riley had concerns when you

12 responded to CAP when that was their question?

13 A. Well, it talked about QC failures,

14 morphine results in a hair batch, and proposed

15 enhancements. So 1 and 2 do indicate that, right?

16 The concern of QC failures, and number 2, morphine

17 results in a hair batch. And then it goes on to

18 talk about the enhancements. So those were the two

19 concerns she raised.

20 Q. You know that when Dr. Riley

21 expressed her concerns to you, she said that if she

22 were called as an expert witness, she could tear

23 apart the results that Averhealth was producing,

24 correct?

25 A. She did state that, yes.

3 testify, and she was found -- in a case against us.

4 Q. We'll talk about that case.

5 A. Okay. But --

Q. Why didn't -- why didn't you tell --

7 A. She was not found to be a credible

8 witness --

6

9 Q. That was -- that was --

10 A. -- so her statement said that --

11 Q. Excuse me --

12 A. -- but she was not found --

13 Q. -- that was --

14 A. -- to be a credible witness.

15 Q. -- that was after this letter was

16 written, correct?

17 A. Correct.

18 Q. Okay. Why in this letter did you --

19 didn't you admit that Dr. Riley said that the test

20 results were so bad she could tear them apart?

A. Because we didn't believe that she

22 could tear them apart because we believed and have

23 faith that the test results that we did are

24 analytically sound and our results are forensically

25 defensible.

21

1 Q. The question wasn't what you believe.

2 The question that CAP asked you was: What concerns

3 were expressed to you?

4 Correct?

5 A. Yes, and we expressed her concerns in

6 one and two.

7 Q. You did not tell CAP that she thought

8 the test results were so bad she could tear them

9 apart.

12

15

18

10 A. We did not.

11 Q. Okay. In -- in point two --

A. Uh-huh.

13 Q. Sorry. If you look -- let's go look

14 at Dr. Riley's e-mail to you.

A. Okay.

16 Q. I don't recall the exhibit number.

17 A. I don't either. 31?

Q. Looking back at Exhibit 31,

19 Dr. Riley's e-mail to you of Sunday, November 1st,

20 do you see at the bottom of the second page, she

21 has her second point regarding a method improvement

22 for hair?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And in the second sentence of that

25 paragraph, she states: Apparently some changes



#: Dozginique Delagnes #: Dozginique Delagnes #: Dozginique Delagnes #: Dozginique Delagnes							
4	Page 25	Page 27					
1	were made in the method to improve THC recovery.						
2	THC is it's basically marijuana,	2 A. Yes, we do. 3 Q. Is this letter to CAP consistent with					
3	correct?						
4	A. Yes, it's a metabolite of marijuana.	4 Averhealth's view of transparency?					
5	Q. And she says: And ever since, the	5 A. Yes, it is.					
6	recovery of the other drugs has been extremely	6 Q. And did Averhealth expect that this 7 letter of November 18th to CAP would resolve the					
	poor.	8 complaints?					
8	Do you see that? A. I do.						
9		9 A. We answered all the questions. We 10 didn't know whether it would actually resolve the					
10	Q. In your in Averhealth's letter to						
11	CAP of November 18th in answer to the question of						
12	"What concerns were raised," you did not mention,						
13	or Dr. Glinn on behalf of Averhealth, did not	, , , ,					
14	mention that Dr. Riley said that: Ever since	14 concluding sentence of her letter of November 18th,					
15		15 Exhibit 45, she says: We look forward to resolving					
16	recovery, the recovery of other drugs has been	16 the matter as quickly as possible.					
17	extremely poor. You didn't tell CAP that, did you,	17 Do you see that? 18 A. I do.					
18							
19	A. That is not in this letter, no.	19 Q. So Dr. Glinn expected that this20 letter would resolve the complaints, correct?					
20	Q. And Dr. Riley also told you that	20 letter would resolve the complaints, correct? 21 A. That's					
21	these are not problems I am comfortable letting						
22	continue, correct? Strike that.	, ,					
23	In the e-mail in your e-mail in	23 for speculation as to what someone else expected.24 Go ahead.					
24	Exhibit 31 of 7:06 p.m. on November 1st, she						
25	ancwared vour duaction about I don't think the	175 THE WITNESS: NO WOULD cald that					
25	answered your question about I don't think the	25 THE WITNESS: No, we just said that					
	Page 26	Page 28					
1	Page 26 dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I	Page 28 1 we looked forward to resolving the matter.					
1 2	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep.	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as					
1	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct?	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as 3 possible?					
1 2 3 4	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail,	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as 3 possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words.					
1 2 3 4 5	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes.	Page 28 1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words. 5 Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter					
1 2 3 4 5 6	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as 3 possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words. 5 Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter 6 of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell	Page 28 1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words. 5 Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached various documents, correct?					
1 2 3 4 5 6	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was	Page 28 1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as 3 possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words. 5 Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter 6 of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached 7 various documents, correct? 8 A. Correct.					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was inconsistency with prep, did you?	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as 3 possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words. 5 Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter 6 of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached 7 various documents, correct? 8 A. Correct. 9 Q. There is attached she refers to,					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was inconsistency with prep, did you? A. That is not in this letter, no.	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as 3 possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words. 5 Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter 6 of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached 7 various documents, correct? 8 A. Correct. 9 Q. There is attached she refers to, 10 in exhibit attachment A, mass spectrometry					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was inconsistency with prep, did you? A. That is not in this letter, no. Q. Is this the kind of transparency that	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as 3 possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words. 5 Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter 6 of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached 7 various documents, correct? 8 A. Correct. 9 Q. There is attached she refers to, 10 in exhibit attachment A, mass spectrometry 11 confirmation procedures; attachment B, method					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was inconsistency with prep, did you? A. That is not in this letter, no. Q. Is this the kind of transparency that Averhealth believes in?	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as 3 possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words. 5 Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter 6 of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached 7 various documents, correct? 8 A. Correct. 9 Q. There is attached she refers to, 10 in exhibit attachment A, mass spectrometry 11 confirmation procedures; attachment B, method 12 validation summaries; attachment C1, September 13					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was inconsistency with prep, did you? A. That is not in this letter, no. Q. Is this the kind of transparency that Averhealth believes in? A. When we provide transparency, we were	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as 3 possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words. 5 Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter 6 of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached 7 various documents, correct? 8 A. Correct. 9 Q. There is attached she refers to, 10 in exhibit attachment A, mass spectrometry 11 confirmation procedures; attachment B, method 12 validation summaries; attachment C1, September 13 13 2020, meeting minutes. And they go on to include					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was inconsistency with prep, did you? A. That is not in this letter, no. Q. Is this the kind of transparency that Averhealth believes in?	Page 28 1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as 3 possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words. 5 Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter 6 of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached 7 various documents, correct? 8 A. Correct. 9 Q. There is attached she refers to, 10 in exhibit attachment A, mass spectrometry 11 confirmation procedures; attachment B, method 12 validation summaries; attachment C1, September 13 13 2020, meeting minutes. And they go on to include 14 attachment C2, attachment D, attachment E,					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was inconsistency with prep, did you? A. That is not in this letter, no. Q. Is this the kind of transparency that Averhealth believes in? A. When we provide transparency, we were asked about issues. She made two points on here,	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as 3 possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words. 5 Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter 6 of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached 7 various documents, correct? 8 A. Correct. 9 Q. There is attached she refers to, 10 in exhibit attachment A, mass spectrometry 11 confirmation procedures; attachment B, method 12 validation summaries; attachment C1, September 13 13 2020, meeting minutes. And they go on to include 14 attachment C2, attachment D, attachment E,					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was inconsistency with prep, did you? A. That is not in this letter, no. Q. Is this the kind of transparency that Averhealth believes in? A. When we provide transparency, we were asked about issues. She made two points on here, and both of those were indicated in the letter.	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as 3 possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words. 5 Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter 6 of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached 7 various documents, correct? 8 A. Correct. 9 Q. There is attached she refers to, 10 in exhibit attachment A, mass spectrometry 11 confirmation procedures; attachment B, method 12 validation summaries; attachment C1, September 13 13 2020, meeting minutes. And they go on to include 14 attachment C2, attachment D, attachment E, 15 attachment F, G, H, and I. Approximately 10					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was inconsistency with prep, did you? A. That is not in this letter, no. Q. Is this the kind of transparency that Averhealth believes in? A. When we provide transparency, we were asked about issues. She made two points on here, and both of those were indicated in the letter. Q. So not A. She gave two examples and we provided	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as possible? A. Yes, those are the words. Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached various documents, correct? A. Correct. Q. There is attached she refers to, in exhibit attachment A, mass spectrometry confirmation procedures; attachment B, method validation summaries; attachment C1, September 13 2020, meeting minutes. And they go on to include attachment C2, attachment D, attachment E, attachment F, G, H, and I. Approximately 10 attachments, correct? A. Correct.					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was inconsistency with prep, did you? A. That is not in this letter, no. Q. Is this the kind of transparency that Averhealth believes in? A. When we provide transparency, we were asked about issues. She made two points on here, and both of those were indicated in the letter. Q. So not	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as possible? A. Yes, those are the words. Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached various documents, correct? A. Correct. Q. There is attached she refers to, in exhibit attachment A, mass spectrometry confirmation procedures; attachment B, method validation summaries; attachment C1, September 13 2020, meeting minutes. And they go on to include attachment C2, attachment D, attachment E, attachment F, G, H, and I. Approximately 10 attachments, correct? A. Correct.					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was inconsistency with prep, did you? A. That is not in this letter, no. Q. Is this the kind of transparency that Averhealth believes in? A. When we provide transparency, we were asked about issues. She made two points on here, and both of those were indicated in the letter. Q. So not A. She gave two examples and we provided those examples in the letter.	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words. 5 Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached various documents, correct? 8 A. Correct. 9 Q. There is attached she refers to, in exhibit attachment A, mass spectrometry confirmation procedures; attachment B, method validation summaries; attachment C1, September 13 2020, meeting minutes. And they go on to include attachment C2, attachment D, attachment E, attachment F, G, H, and I. Approximately 10 attachments, correct? 17 A. Correct. 18 Q. Those were not produced to the plaintiffs. Do you know what happened to those?					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was inconsistency with prep, did you? A. That is not in this letter, no. Q. Is this the kind of transparency that Averhealth believes in? A. When we provide transparency, we were asked about issues. She made two points on here, and both of those were indicated in the letter. Q. So not A. She gave two examples and we provided those examples in the letter. Q. But other things you didn't provide.	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as possible? 4 A. Yes, those are the words. 5 Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached various documents, correct? 8 A. Correct. 9 Q. There is attached she refers to, in exhibit attachment A, mass spectrometry confirmation procedures; attachment B, method validation summaries; attachment C1, September 13 2020, meeting minutes. And they go on to include attachment C2, attachment D, attachment E, attachment F, G, H, and I. Approximately 10 attachments, correct? 17 A. Correct. 18 Q. Those were not produced to the plaintiffs. Do you know what happened to those?					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was inconsistency with prep, did you? A. That is not in this letter, no. Q. Is this the kind of transparency that Averhealth believes in? A. When we provide transparency, we were asked about issues. She made two points on here, and both of those were indicated in the letter. Q. So not A. She gave two examples and we provided those examples in the letter. Q. But other things you didn't provide. My question is: Is that consistent with	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as possible? A. Yes, those are the words. Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached various documents, correct? A. Correct. Q. There is attached she refers to, in exhibit attachment A, mass spectrometry confirmation procedures; attachment B, method validation summaries; attachment C1, September 13 2020, meeting minutes. And they go on to include attachment C2, attachment D, attachment E, attachment F, G, H, and I. Approximately 10 attachments, correct? A. Correct. Q. Those were not produced to the plaintiffs. Do you know what happened to those? A. Some of these were. You have copies of our confirmation procedures, you have					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	dilute-and-shoot is the problem. She says: I think it's inconsistency with prep. She said that, correct? A. Those are her words in this e-mail, yes. Q. In answer to CAP's question about what concerns people had expressed, you didn't tell them that Dr. Riley believed there was inconsistency with prep, did you? A. That is not in this letter, no. Q. Is this the kind of transparency that Averhealth believes in? A. When we provide transparency, we were asked about issues. She made two points on here, and both of those were indicated in the letter. Q. So not A. She gave two examples and we provided those examples in the letter. Q. But other things you didn't provide. My question is: Is that consistent with Averhealth's view of transparency? A. We provide transparency to our	1 we looked forward to resolving the matter. Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As quickly as possible? A. Yes, those are the words. Q. All right. Dr. Glinn, in her letter of November 18th, 2020, Exhibit 45, attached various documents, correct? A. Correct. Q. There is attached she refers to, in exhibit attachment A, mass spectrometry confirmation procedures; attachment B, method validation summaries; attachment C1, September 13 2020, meeting minutes. And they go on to include attachment C2, attachment D, attachment E, attachment F, G, H, and I. Approximately 10 attachments, correct? A. Correct. Q. Those were not produced to the plaintiffs. Do you know what happened to those? A. Some of these were. You have copies of our confirmation procedures, you have					

24 inaccurately reported, we go back to those

25 customers and we notify them of that fact.

888-893-3767

24

25

A. Okay.

Q. -- were not produced to us so that we

Page: 8 of 111 PageID July 09, 2024 **Dominique** Delagnes Page 31 know what -- what Averhealth submitted to CAP. 1 Q. I'll show you one example, just to 2 What happened to those? We were told that those 2 make sure this doesn't refresh your recollection of 3 were not -having seen it. 4 A. We sent the original copies along 4 A. Thank you. with the letter when it was shipped to them. We 5 MR. CEJAS: Was this produced in this did not retain the copies. They were shipped to case, Rick? I just have not recognized the page 6 7 CAP. 7 number. 8 You sent attachments to CAP without 8 MR. CORNFELD: Yeah, this was retaining them in your files? 9 9 produced by us to you. But I know that Armstrong 10 A. We did. 10 also -- I mean, we received this on a FOIA request 11 Is -- I'm astounded. I can't imagine from the Michigan Department of Health and Human 12 Services and -you would want not to keep a record of -- I mean, 12 those were thousands of pages, weren't they? We've 13 MR. CEJAS: I'm just going to -- I'm seen references in CAP's documents that you taking your word for it. I'm going to put just a 14 submitted thousands of pages, and CAP was going -standing objection on here to the extent it hasn't 15 16 you expected CAP was going to be reviewing them. 16 been produced. I can't say one way or the other. 17 correct? 17 I don't recognize it as I'm sitting here with this 18 particular Bates number, so I'm going to lodge my MR. CEJAS: Object to the form. 19 Argumentative. 19 objection. You can go ahead and question the 20 20 witness. Go ahead. 21 21 THE WITNESS: I don't remember the MR. CORNFELD: I just want to also exact number of pages. We -- we submitted the 22 22 say that I know from the response to my FOIA originals over to them, and we did not retain a 23 request that Armstrong also submitted a FOIA 23 24 24 copy. request to MDHHS and received documents. That's 25 (BY MR. CORNFELD) And -- and you 25 because they produced the same -- they produced to Page 30 Page 32 expected that CAP would be reviewing those and me what they had produced to Armstrong, at least in possibly providing comments to you about them, 2 response to one FOIA request. 3 correct? 3 So I suspect you also received this, 4 A. Possibly, yes. and the Bates Number MICH, that prefix is -- if you 5 Q. Wouldn't you want to keep copies of look at the lower right, that's the prefix that we what you sent so you would have a record so you 6 used for the documents that we produced from our could understand what CAP was saying when they sent FOIA request. 7 8 you their comments? 8 MR. CEJAS: I don't see it in my file. So again, I'm -- if you tell me you produced 9 A. We believed that if they had 9 10 questions or comments about it, that we could still 10 it, I'm just going to -- I'm going to lodge an 11 answer those. objection to the extent this has not been produced, 12 Q. So why did you keep the cover pages, 12 and you know, if you can prove me wrong, that's attachment A mass spectrometry confirmation 13 fine, but I don't see that it has been. 14 procedures and so forth? 14 MR. CORNFELD: I also believe this 15 A. This was a -- this was a Word 15 was an exhibit to the Second-Amended Complaint. In document. And along with it was each of the -- as fact, all of the -- all of the internal CAP 16 16 part of that Word document was each of the names of 17 17 documents that -- that commented on the Averhealth submissions were -- were attached to the

18 the attachments. 19 Do you know that the parties in the case have obtained internal CAP documents, memos, 20

21 and e-mails by CAP officials commenting about

22 Averhealth submissions?

23 No, I'm not aware.

24 Q. You've not seen those?

25 Α. I have not.

888-893-3767



19

20

21

22

23

24

it has --

Second-Amended Complaint as exhibits.

MR. CORNFELD: Okay.

25 it hasn't been, I'm going to move to strike

my objection to the extent it hasn't been. And if

MR. CEJAS: -- that's fine. But if

MR. CEJAS: Okay. I'm going to lodge

Page: 9 of 111 PageID July 09, 2024 **Dominique** Delagnes Page 33 Page 35 whatever question you have on this. But go ahead 1 There's another quote from Portillo. 2 (BY MR. CORNFELD) Okay. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) In what 3 Ms. Delagnes, you've been handed Exhibit 46, which 3 paragraphs? is a memo under the letterhead College of American 4 A. It was -- can I give you the number? Pathologists. It's to Arthur M. Zebelman from Lena 5 So page 26, it starts at number 97. MR. CEJAS: Did you see any 6 Portillo dated December 17, 2020. 7 This is an example of the -- the underlying documents from which those quotes are internal documents that we received -- the internal pulled? CAP documents that we received from MDHHS. You 9 THE WITNESS: No, just quotes. I've told me you didn't think you had seen any of them. not seen these documents. Does this jog your recollection that you've seen 11 11 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Okay. So you --12 this? 12 A. I have not seen any documents, just 13 A. I have not seen this. This is the 13 the quotes that are pulled out of here. 14 first time I've seen this letter. 14 All right. So -- so you haven't seen 15 Q. Okay. Then you can put it aside. any documents where you could put the quotes into 15 16 Α. Okay. 16 the context of --17 17 Q. And I -- I won't -- I won't even show Α. No. you -- I mean, if you say you haven't seen any 18 Q. All right. And you didn't -- you 19 them, I don't think I --19 didn't see them in preparing for your 30(b)(6) for 20 A. I have not seen this one. I don't 20 your corporate designation deposition, correct? 21 know about any, but I -- I have not specifically 21 A. I did not. 22 22 seen this letter. MR. CEJAS: And I can't find where 23 23 Q. You don't recall seeing any of them, they've been produced to us, so -- so I'm 24 I take it? 24 lodging -- again, to the extent that you-all have 25 I have not seen this one. relevant exhibits that haven't been turned over. Page 36 Page 34 that's going to be a problem. We can address it Q. Any internal -- any internal CAP documents? 2 2 later. 3 A. I agree with you that in one of the 3 MR. PLEBAN: So did you look in the amended complaints, I think that there might be 4 4 old case? some information, but not this one. I have not 5 MR. CEJAS: Which one?

seen this. There's some other quotes that I've 7 seen. 8 Q. And I take it you did not see any of the internal CAP documents over -- in the last 10 couple of weeks, few weeks, correct? 11 A. Again, I have to recall. I believe in the Second-Amended Complaint which -- that you indicated, that there was a limited e-mail that I've seen, and that's it. 15 Q. What was that e-mail? 16 A. I don't -- I'd have to look at the 17 documents. It's something --18 THE WITNESS: Nick, I'm looking at you because I see all the binders there. Can we

look at the Second-Amended Complaint?

THE WITNESS: 26 and 28.

number 97, quote, something that Ms. Portillo

MR. PLEBAN: What page is that on?

So in the Second-Amended Complaint,

20

21

22

23

24

25

said --

6 MR. PLEBAN: Let's go off for a 7 second. 8 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Time is 9:24 a.m. 9 We are off the record. 10 (A discussion was held off the 11 record.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 9:25. 12 13 We're back on the record. 14 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You've been handed 15 what's been marked as Exhibit 47, which is a letter on letterhead of the College of American 16 17 Pathologists dated December 22nd, 2020, to Dr. Glinn from CAP signed by Lena Portillo, Investigations Analyst of the CAP Accreditation 19 20 Programs. 21 Do you see that? 22 Yes. Α.

And this was CAP's response to

Dr. Glinn's letter of December 17th, correct?

Yes.



23

24

25

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 10 of 111 Page Dominion Delagnes July 09, 2024 Page 37 Page 39 And if you go four lines down --Actually, December 18th. 1 Q. 2 Α. November 18th? 2 well, strike that, 3 3 She gives examples of what she Q. I'm sorry, November 18th, yes. 4 November 18th, yes. 4 considers unacceptable practices beginning with: 5 Okay. And Ms. Portillo asks CAP to 5 For example. submit various items, correct? 6 Do you see that? 6 7 7 For example, the policy states? Asks Averhealth to submit various? 8 I'm sorry, Ms. Portillo asked 8 9 A. I -- I -- I see that, yes. 9 Averhealth to submit various items, correct? 10 10 Q. All right. And then four lines down, Α. Yes. she says: One of those unacceptable practices is 11 Q. And they explained why they wanted 11 those items, correct? 12 if both QC sets need to be excluded, use historical 13 A. Yes. 13 QCs. You start out by saying: Additional 14 Do you see that? 14 Q. information is needed to facilitate our evaluation. 15 Yes. 15 Α. 16 Do you see that, at the end of the 16 Q. And QC stands for quality control, 17 first paragraph of the letter, Exhibit 47? 17 correct? A. Yes. 18 18 A. Yes. 19 And then she states: Please submit 19 And that was something Averhealth was doing up to that point was using historical QCs, 20 the following items, and the first bullet point 20 21 says: Several proficiency test challenges show 21 correct? 22 22 unacceptable results or significant bias. A. Very rarely, yes. 23 And she doesn't say very rarely. She 23 Correct? 24 A. That's what this says, yes. 24 just says this is an unacceptable practice, 25 And she states that as a fact, not as 25 correct? Page 38 Page 40 an allegation that they're evaluating, correct? 1 A. That's what she says, but you asked 1 me did we use it. Yes, we used historical QCs very 2 That's what this states, yes. 2 3 rarely. I'm factually telling you it was used in a And so she asks for detailed 3 corrective actions for all unacceptable proficiency very infrequent basis. 4 4 testing results from 2019 and 2020. 5 Q. She -- she -- at the end of that 5 6 Do you see that? 6 paragraph, she says: This is data manipulation to accommodate poor responses and accept runs or a 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. And also Averhealth's policy for 8 patient sample without understanding why there are

9 discrepancies.

10 Do you see that?

11 A. Yes.

12 And she states that as a factual

13 statement, correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And then in the next major bullet

point, Ms. Portillo states: There are instances 16

17 where practice does not follow the QC policy.

Do you see that?

19 Yes. A.

18

20 Q. She says: For example -- and this --

21 and she gives examples of where the practice does

22 not follow the quality control policy, correct?

23 Yes.

24 25

And she says: For example, the policy states that the lower limit of reporting

Q. And it states that as a fact, not as

an allegation, correct?

Yes, it does.

23

24 25

Page: 11 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 41 manipulation using historical QCs. She said that's may be at or above the lowest calibrator. There 2 2 are instances where the laboratory did not obtain a manipulation, correct? 3 A. She said these manipulations, and she results for calibrator one or two and reported values less than the recovered calibrator value. cited three things, right? Change in the IS -- her full sentence says: These manipulations, which is 5 Do you see that? change in the IS, changing the regression of the 6 Yes. Α. 7 calibration curve, and using historical QCs. And those are examples of where 8 Averhealth's practices did not follow its policies, 8 Q. All right. 9 So all of that -- if I can finish my 9 correct? 10 10 sentence -- she says happened fairly frequently. Α. Yes. As I'd indicated yesterday, changing an IS used and 11 Q. And another example is the statement change in the regression of the calibration curve in the policy that no more than 25 percent of the 13 total number of data points per curve may be are processes that we used then, use today, and have been verified by CAP that are acceptable 14 excluded without a director designee review, 15 correct? 15 practices. 16 Α. Yes. 16 Q. Did you -- did you -- do you continue Q. And show that where that's violated, 17 17 to use historical QCs? 18 A. We do not. she says: There are instances of three out of 18 19 eight calibrators not being included in the curve 19 Q. So that's something that doctor -when you told us yesterday that the things that 20 indicating unstable calibration. Dr. Riley complained about are things that you're 21 Correct? 21 22 22 still doing, that wasn't true for historical QCs? That's what she stated, yes. 23 A. I only said we were doing two of 23 And she stated that as a factual 24 them. Correct. I underlined -- and I even

24 statement, correct?

Q.

25 That's what she stated, yes.

Page 42

Exhibit 31, on which section?

If we look again at Exhibit 31

Exhibit 31, Dr. Riley's e-mail to

5 you.

1

2

3

4

6 Α. Uh-huh.

November 1st, 2020, her e-mail on 7

8 that Sunday in Exhibit 31, she gives as example

9 one, she says: This is a general example because

10 this happens fairly frequently.

regarding historical QCs --

11 Correct?

12 That's what she said in her e-mail,

13 but that's not accurate.

14 Q. Well --

15 Α. It's --

16 -- you may disagree, but Dr. Riley Q.

17 said --

She said that, but --18 A.

19 Excuse me, let me finish my question.

20 You may disagree, and I think you

21 said you disagree, so you don't need to say it

22 again. But Dr. Riley's view was that the use of

23 historical QCs happened fairly frequently, correct?

24 That was her opinion, yes.

25 And she says -- she called that a to use the ability to change the regression as well

underlined them on here, so I said that we continue

as to change the IS that's used. 2

3 Q. In this letter from CAP dated

December 22, 2020, CAP asked you to send yet

5 additional information, correct?

6 Yes, they did. Α.

7 And did you attempt to comply with

8 that?

9

12

18

Δ We did send them additional

information. It's Exhibit 29 from yesterday. 10

11 Okay. Thank you.

You're welcome.

13 Q. Do you have in front of you

14 Exhibit 29?

15 A. Yes, I do.

Q. And is that the letter that 16

17 Averhealth sent to CAP in response to Exhibit 47?

Yes, it is.

19 And it's a letter dated January 4,

20 2021, directed to Ms. Portillo of CAP and signed by

21 Dr. Glinn, correct?

22 Yes. Α.

23 This is the letter we talked about

yesterday where Dr. Glinn said it is perplexing 24

25 that Sarah Riley never once raised any concerns



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 12 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 45 Page 47 while working for Averhealth, correct? should have felt obligated to make these 2 A. Yes. 2 complaints, you're not changing that testimony, are 3 Okay. So I don't need to ask you Q. 3 you? about that again. 4 I'm not changing any of my testimony. Α. 5 Dr. Glinn goes on to say in the third 5 You mentioned -- just a moment ago, paragraph of the first page of Exhibit 29, the 6 6 you mentioned the Department of Justice. letter to CAP on January 4, 2021, she vilifies 7 Uh-huh. Dr. Riley by saying: She disregarded the 8 Q. Yes? principles of ethical conduct for the toxicology 9 Yes. Α. 10 profession by violating confidentiality, honesty, 10 Q. Averhealth settled the Department of 11 and personal integrity, and by discrediting the Justice investigation by agreeing to pay the United 11 12 profession. 12 States government \$1.3 million, correct? 13 Do you see that? 13 Α. Yes. 14 A. I do. 14 Q. What was that -- and that was for 15 What was the principle of ethical violating Averhealth's policies, correct? 15 conduct that Dr. Glinn claimed on behalf of 16 16 A. It was not having to do anything with Averhealth that --17 17 our test results, no. It was a contractual --18 A. That she was going out and telling they -- they --18 19 everybody that our results were wrong anywhere from 19 Q. It was not? 20 30 to 50 percent of the time. 20 Α. No, no, we never admitted to a 21 Q. You told us yesterday that you didn't 21 violation. 22 blame her for that because that was her sincere 22 I understand that. When -- you know, opinion and, in fact, she was -- she was obligated I settled -- I can't count the number of cases I've 23 23 24 to -- to do that, correct? 24 settled in my career and neither side ever admits 25 A. It has yet to be found by CAP, by the 25 the other side was correct. But you settled the Page 46 Page 48 Department of Justice, by when she testified Department of Justice's investigation by agreeing to pay \$1.3 million, correct? 2 against us that --2 3 Q. Excuse me, that's not my question. 3 A. We did --4 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form. My question was: You told us yesterday that she was obligated to do that given that that was her 5 Argumentative. 6 Go ahead. sincere opinion, and you didn't blame her for that. Are you changing what you said yesterday? 7 THE WITNESS: We did because, as you 7 8 A. I don't know that I used the words I know, having attorneys is very expensive, a 9 didn't blame her for doing that. 9 distraction, and expensive to the organization. So 10 Q. Whatever you said --10 we made the business decision to settle. What --11 A. You asked me --11 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) All right. 12 Q. Whatever you said --12 A. -- what didn't come out and what the 13 -- a question, and I said that if she 13 Department of Justice did not agree or look in to 14 felt that way, that -- but she still -- she drug pursue is all of the allegations that Dr. Riley 15 Averhealth through the mud and made claims that 15 made in the -- in the complaint around the test 16 have never been found to be actually the case. 16 results being wrong 30 percent of the time, around 17 17 using the -- by changing the regression, and by 18 And that's what we intended -using historic QCs. All of that, they chose not to 19

Q. We'll get to that. pursue because there's valid, analytical reasons to 19 Okay. 20 do that. 21

My question is: Are you changing Q. Do you think maybe the Department of what you said --22 Justice decided that as long as Averhealth had No, I'm not changing what I said 23 agreed to pay so much money, they didn't need to yesterday.

bring a bigger lawsuit, they could just accept the 24

25 \$1.3 million as satisfaction of all of their



-- about -- about whether Dr. Riley

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α.

Page Dominique Delagnes Page 49

2

7

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Page: 13 of 111 July 09, 2024 both on our testing processes as well as on the Q. Well, the testing processes were -that was part of the contract that you were

4 Calls for speculation.

No.

5 Go ahead.

claims?

A.

2

3

THE WITNESS: No. 6

7 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You don't think

MR. CEJAS: Object to the form.

8 \$1.3 million was an adequate satisfaction of the

government's claim? 9

10 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Calls for a

legal conclusion. 11

12 THE WITNESS: No.

13 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Do you -- why is

14 that? Isn't that a lot of money?

15 Because -- because if the Department

16 of Justice truly believed that there was issues

17 with test results, they would have pursued it. We

showed them through the investigation that the 18

19 testing that we're doing had sound, solid,

scientific backing behind it and that we produced 20

21 accurate test results.

22 The Department of Justice's

23 investigation was -- and their lawsuit was purely

24 to get money, correct? It was a -- it was a

25 lawsuit for money for violation of the False Claims contract.

3

5 supposed to do, use sound testing practices,

6 correct?

A. We use sound testing practices.

8 But that was part of the contract 9 that you were -- under the contract, you were

supposed to use sound testing practices. 10

Which we did.

12 I understand it's your position that you did, but that was part of the contract is my question, correct? Strike that. 14

Part of the contract was you were supposed to use sound testing practices?

A. Correct.

And if the government could satisfy its monetary claim for something other than that, then there would be no reason to pursue the claim regarding sound testing practices --

MR. CEJAS: Object --

(BY MR. CORNFELD) -- if it already

24 -- if it already had its monetary claim satisfied.

MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Calls

Page 50

Act by Averhealth, correct?

2 A. I'm not sure.

Q. So if -- if -- I mean. I've settled 3

cases, and if you can get what you want for only a

small portion of doing the work that you need to

do, that's a great settlement. Don't you think the

7 Department of Justice was satisfied that their --8 that what they were claiming, they had received?

9 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form.

10 Calls for speculation.

11 THE WITNESS: They fully investigated

the claims that were introduced by Sarah Riley, and 12

in -- and that was all around our -- our testing

14 processes. Through that investigation, we were

able to show that our testing results were accurate 15

16 and all of the process and procedures that we use

17 were -- were analytically sound, and so they

18 choose -- chose not to pursue that.

19 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) The -- the claim

20 was a claim of breach of contract by Averhealth

21 that it -- that it failed to live up to what it

22 agreed to do for the -- for the government in its

23 testing practices, correct?

24 A. The original -- the original

complaint was around our testing -- was two parts.

for speculation.

2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Do you under- --

3 do you understand that?

4 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Calls

for speculation --

6 THE WITNESS: I don't understand

7 that.

11

14

20

25

8 MR. CEJAS: -- calls for a legal

conclusion. 9

10 COURT REPORTER: Hold on.

THE WITNESS: Sorry.

MR. CEJAS: Calls for speculation and

13 a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: I don't understand

15 that.

16 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) What -- what did

17 Averhealth do, in your view, to -- to demonstrate

or attempt to demonstrate to the government that 18

19 its testing practices were sound?

A. We provided scientific papers,

21 information, results back to the government that

showed that the practices that we used are 22

23 scientifically valid and forensically defensible,

24 and accepted by both CLIA and CAP.

Q. Are you referring to Dr. Klette's



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 14 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 53 Page 55 report? 2021? 1 1 2 2 Α. Not just Dr. Klette's report, but Α. They did not find all claims 3 other information that -- that we had sent to them. 3 substantiated. What was that other information? 4 4 Q. Look at the bottom of page 2 of -- of 5 Α. There was a letter from Miranda page -- of the letter Exhibit 47. I'm sorry, 5 Booker --6 Exhibit 29. Strike that. 7 Q. Okay. 7 Look at the bottom of page 2 of 8 A. -- that outlined that the practices Dr. Glinn's letter to CAP of January 4, 2021. that we used as far as, you know, we've already Exhibit 29, and she addresses PT number 3: Submit 10 discussed, which is historic calibrations, changing the alternative PT assessments performed on hair internal standards, and changing regression, that 11 samples. 11 those are all sound, valid practices accepted by 12 Do you see that? both the College of American Pathologists as well 13 Α. Yes. as CLIA. 14 And she states that she has enclosed 15 Q. Miranda -- is it Miranda Booker? 15 results for hair testing proficiency results. 16 Α. Uh-huh. 16 These are ordered from LGC, which is the most 17 Q. Is that right? 17 widely used proficiency testing program for hair 18 That is correct. testing. And she states: No results were 19 She's an attorney, correct? 19 unacceptable. 20 Α. She is. 20 Do you see that? 21 Q. She's not a scientist like 21 Α. Yes. 22 Dr. Klette? 22 That was a false statement, wasn't 23 23 it? Α. She also -- no, but she referenced 24 scientific papers and information and data in the 24 Not that I'm aware of, no. Α. 25 response. 25 Let's look at what she submitted, if Page 54 Page 56 1 Q. All right. Is that -- and is that you would look at page 21744. 2 2 what you're referring to? Because we've -- that's Do you have that page? 3 been produced to us, but I don't think we've been 3 Α. Yes. produced any other materials that were submitted to 4 Q. And -- and do you see that this is

5 the Department of Justice.

6 A. That is what I'm speaking of, yes.

Okay. If you look at page 2 of 7

Dr. Glinn's letter to CAP dated January 4, 2021,

Exhibit 29, do you see in the first full paragraph

10 on that page, Dr. Glinn states: We believe that

upon your review of the information enclosed

herein, you will arrive at a finding of not

13 substantiated?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Correct? That didn't happen, did it?

16 Α. It did.

17 They -- they arrived at a finding of

not substantiated in response to the information 18

19 that you submitted -- that Dr. Glinn submitted --

20 Α. Not all claims are substantiated.

21 Q. Excuse me. Excuse me.

22 Α. Uh-huh.

23 They didn't arrive at a finding of

not substantiated in response to the information 24

25 that Averhealth submitted to CAP on January 4,

the attachment that Dr. Glinn submitted that is the

6 report of the proficiency testing by LGC?

7 Α. Yes.

8 Q. And let's look at the hair

proficiency test results for June 2020, which

10 Dr. Glinn says found nothing unacceptable. And do

11 you see that on page 21748?

> Yes. Α.

12

13 And -- and do you see that it shows a

14 total of four questionable results and one

15 unsatisfactory result?

16 A. I see that as a summary. I'm -- I'm

17 not used to looking at this, so I would need

Dr. Glinn to explain why she had indicated that on

19 this report.

20 Q. Why -- why she said that nothing was

21 found to be unacceptable when there was one

22 unsatisfactory result and four questionable

23 results?

24 A. I don't know how to read this table,

25 so I cannot answer that question.



Page: 15 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 57 Page 59 Q. All right. If you would look at MR. CEJAS: So I'm going to move to page 21674 of Dr. Glinn's letter of January 4 to 2 strike the question. Go ahead and restart it. CAP, she states -- I'm sorry, do you have that 3 MR. CORNFELD: Yeah, yeah. page? 4 4 (BY MR. CORNFELD) I mean you say 5 A. Hold on. I was just looking at the rare, Dr. Riley said fairly frequent. Whether it summary because all these say a hundred percent, so was rare or frequent, CAP made you stop using I'm looking at the next page. I'm back to these, historical QCs because using historical QCs is although you say this summary's there, I don't know 8 improper, correct? if that's -- because then if you look at the 9 A. We chose to stop using historical following page where it talks about the samples, it 10 QCs. 11 says 100 percent satisfactory and 80 percent 11 Because CAP made you do it? satisfactory on benzoylecgonine. So I'm trying to 12 A. They didn't make us do it. As part figure out, but I guess we can table that for 13 of the quality improvement process, we stopped Dr. Glinn and she could interpret it for you. using historical QCs. 14 15 Q. Because 80 percent satisfactory would 15 In response to CAP's complaint, 16 mean 20 percent unsatisfactory, correct? 16 correct? 17 A. I -- I will leave it Dr. Glinn to 17 Α. Yes. explain it to you. Sorry, what page are you on? 18 18 Q. Kind of like settling a lawsuit, I 19 Q. All right. 21674. 19 quess. 20 A. Okay. 20 MR. CEJAS: Objection. 21 And do you see Dr. Glinn states in 21 (BY MR. CORNFELD) They didn't the first full paragraph at the top of the page: 22 22 litigate it with you, but they said this is wrong, Consistent with industry practices, when the above 23 23 and you said okay, we'll stop doing it, correct? 24 three conditions hold, historical QC data is used 24 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. for the acceptance of the run. 25 Argumentative.

A. Yes.

Page 58 1

6

Q. What made Averhealth believe that 2

3 that was consistent with industry practices?

A. That's a scientific question for 4 5 Dr. Glinn.

6 Q. All right. In fact, CAP -- I mean, I

know I'm jumping ahead, but CAP made you stop using

8 historical QCs, didn't they?

9 Yes, we stopped using historical QCs.

10 Because CAP made you stop using them,

11 correct?

1

2

12 A. Yes. When they were used in very

13 rare instances.

14 Q. Well, you say they're very rare and

Dr. Glinn said they were fairly frequent, but 15

whether they were rare or fairly --16

17 A. I don't think she said -- where did 18 she say frequent? Where did she say frequent?

19 Q. We -- we've already gone over it.

20 I'm not going to go over it again, but whether it

21 was rare --

22 A. Dr. Glinn never said they were very

23 frequent.

Q. I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Dr. Riley. 24

25 Dr. Riley.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: No. Not correct.

3 (BY MR. CORNFELD) They didn't say Q.

4 this is wrong?

5 A. We did not agree. We -- we chose to

settle and -- and there was no factual basis.

7 Okay. All right.

8 A. What we did was proper.

9 When you said you -- you didn't

agree, you -- you also just said you voluntarily 10

stopped using historical QCs. Doesn't that mean an

12 agreement?

13 A. I didn't say we voluntarily. Yes, we

14 stopped using historical QCs.

15 Q. Okay. Would you agree it would be improper to use historical QCs frequently? 16

17 A. That's a question for Dr. Glinn.

MR. CORNFELD: How long have we been

19 going?

18

20 MR. PLEBAN: An hour.

21 MR. CEJAS: Yeah, an hour and

22 12 minutes.

23 MR. CORNFELD: Oh, do you want to

24 take a break now?

25 MR. CEJAS: Yes.



Page: 16 of 111 Page Dominique Delagnes July 09, 2024 Page 61 Page 63 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Time is 9:58 a.m. 1 There are four bullet points, yes. 2 We are off the record. 2 And -- and those they found were 3 3 substantiated, correct? (A short break was taken.) 4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 4 That's what the letter says, yes. 5 5 And -- and those where the same four 10:16 a.m. We are back on the record. allegations that CAP informed you on November 11 in 6 (BY MR. CORNFELD) Ms. Delagnes, do 6 you have in front of you Exhibit 48, which is a Exhibit -- November 11, 2020, in Exhibit 39, were 8 letter from the College of American Pathologists to the allegations that Dr. Rilev had made, correct? A. Those are the four bullets that were 9 Michele Glinn dated January 29th, 2021, signed by 9 Michael B. Datto, M.D., PhD, CAP's accreditation 10 outlined, yes. 10 11 committee chair? 11 Q. Okay. 12 12 I've not seen the full allegations, A. Yes. 13 Q. And do you also have in front of you 13 but yes, those are the four bullets outlined. the letter we looked at yesterday, Exhibit 39, 14 Q. Okay. So the -- so the same 14 15 which is the first letter that CAP sent you allegations that they told you about, that CAP told 15 16 regarding the allegations that had been made to it 16 you about in November of 2020 are the ones they 17 against Averhealth by Dr. Riley? found were substantiated when they placed you on 18 A. Yes. probation, correct? 18 19 Q. All right. So the Exhibit 48, that's 19 That's what the letter says, yes. the letter where CAP told you that they had placed 20 Q. You -- and you have -- you have no 20 way of knowing whether CAP did substantiate those 21 you on probation, correct? 22 allegations other than what CAP told you in the A. Yes. 22 23 23 letter of January 29, 2021, correct? Q. And that was as -- so -- and they say 24 that was as of January 27, 2021, correct? 24 A. I don't understand your question. 25 Α. Yes. Can you rephrase it? Page 62 Page 64 1 Q. They sent the letter by express Q. Do you have any -- do you have any delivery so that you would receive that the next knowledge about whether CAP, in fact, found 2 2

3 day or so, correct?

4 A. Yes.

5 Did you get any advanced notice that

6 you were being placed on probation?

7 Not that I'm aware of.

8 Okay. So the first -- the --

9 Exhibit 48 was the first notice you had that you

were being placed -- Averhealth was being placed on 10

11 probation?

12 A. Yes.

13 And the letter states in the second

14 paragraph: The accreditation committee is

15 especially concerned about the implementation of

policies and procedures to correct the following 16

17 substantiated allegations.

18 Do you see that?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. So they -- they found that the

21 allegations that they set forth in this letter had

22 been substantiated, correct?

23 A. Some of them, yes.

Well, the ones they set forth in the 24

25 letter. There are four bullet points.

Dr. Riley's four allegations to be substantiated 3

other than what they said in the letter of

5 January 29, 2021?

6 Α. No.

7 Okay. And then after the -- they

list the four allegations -- well, let's go through

9 those four allegations.

10 A. Sure.

11 They were concerned regarding

unacceptable quality assurance of mass spectrometry

13 confirmatory testing, correct?

14 A. Yes.

15

18

21

And they -- and there's the failure

to follow procedures as written? 16

17 Yes.

There's concern regarding the

manipulation of instrument calibrations? 19

20 Α.

And there's concern regarding the

22 review of quality control results, correct?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And after each one of these items,

25 CAP set forth the checklist items of -- of what the



Page: 17 of 111 Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 65 checklist items were that they are saying that you the laboratory -- I don't think she was a were in violation of and needed to correct; is that 2 laboratory director. I forgot exactly what her 3 right? 3 title was. 4 A. They cited where these came from. 4 Q. She --Yes, these are the checklist items. 5 5 Michele was still -- Michele Glinn 6 Q. Okay. And then the letter from CAP was still the laboratory director. She was a -placing you on probation says: The committee is 7 the -- the laboratory site director. Okay. And -- and so she worked in particularly concerned about the evaluation of bias 8 and root cause analysis in regard to proficiency 9 9 the laboratory in St. Louis? testing results, as well as the use of historical 10 10 Α. Correct. QC and QC acceptance practices. 11 11 Q. And this chat is from February 16, 12 Do you see that? 2022? 12 13 A. Yes. 13 Α. Yes. 14 Q. And then they -- and -- and you have 14 Q. For -- so about a year after you were no -- no knowledge other than what CAP stated about placed on probation by CAP, correct? 15 15 16 their particular concerns other than what they told Correct. 16 Α. 17 you in this letter, correct? 17 And do you see at 10:05 a.m., there's Q. 18 A. Correct. a message by Nichole Diloretta? 18 19 Then they -- they list items they 19 Α. Yes. want you to submit in addition to what you had 20 20 Q. And she says: Gotcha. Ok. Whew. I 21 already submitted in regard to these various 21 thought for a second they wanted it reported the 22 concerns and findings that they made, correct? 22 other way. No worries. 23 A. Yes. 23 Do you see that? 24 24 And with regard to what they say I do. Α. about their particular concern about the evaluation 25 And then the next sentence is what I Page 66 Page 68 1 want to call to your attention: This is exactly of bias and root cause analysis in regard to 1 what we should do since we never get the time to proficiency testing results, isn't it the case that your staff could never find the time to do that? properly investigate and get a root cause and have 3 A. No. to just report what we can. 4 5 Handing you what's been marked as --5 Do you see that? 6 I'm sorry. I didn't write down the exhibit number. A. I do. 6 49. 7 Is that -- is that true what 7 Α. 8 Okay. You've been handed what's been Ms. Diloretta said, that they never get the time to marked as Exhibit 49, which is a document on the properly investigate and get a root cause? 9 10 A. I know that there's other 10 first page of which is Bates 78821 and has the 11 title on the first page: Short Message Report. circumstances where we do look to get a root cause, so that's what she says in this statement, but 12 Do you see that? A. Where it says Short Message -- yes, I 13 13 that's not something that occurred all the time at

14 do.

15 Okay. And this is a report of a Q. 16 internal chat within Averhealth, correct?

17

Done on your Microsoft Teams internal 18 Q.

19 system, correct?

20 A. Correct.

21 This is between Christina Essington

and Nichole Diloretta, correct? 22

23 Α. Correct.

24 Q. Who is Nichole Diloretta?

25 At this time, she came on as one of 14 the laboratory, no.

15 Q. It did occur at least at times, so

often that she said we never get a root cause -- we

17 never get time to properly investigate and get a

root cause and have to just report what we can, 18

19 correct?

20 A. That's what she said in here, yes.

21 Q. All right. And by "root cause," what

22 that means is that if you get an unexpected result

23 or a result that isn't working out correctly, that

24 means finding out why that happened?

25 Correct.



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 18 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 69 Q. Correct? and have to just report what we can, Ms. Essington 2 A. There's plenty of other instances says: I would not feel comfortable reporting where we did find root causes, including with all something out pos if there -- it is clear this is of our proficiency testing after we were placed on 4 an issue. probation by the College of American Pathologists. 5 Correct? So you can go through and look at all the root 6 That is what she says, yes, correct. cause analysis we did on all of our proficiency 7 What does -- what does POS mean? 8 testing. 8 Positive. 9 Q. All right. And whatever it 9 Okay. If we go back to Exhibit 48, 10 was -- Ms. Diloretta, did she later become the 10 the letter from CAP placing you on probation, among 11 laboratory director? the items of information and explanations and so 11 12 forth that have -- that CAP asked Averhealth -- or A. She did not. 12 13 Q. Okay. But is she still employed by 13 actually insisted that Averhealth provide, there 14 Averhealth? was a detailed explanation of when and how 15 Α. She is not. 15 historical calibration curves and/or historical Well, and -- and why -- why did she 16 Q. 16 quality control are used; is that right? 17 17 leave? A. Yes. 18 She had some medical issues. 18 And to that point, in the fourth Α. 19 All right. It wasn't that she was 19 bullet, CAP says to -- that you have to submit a asked to leave because of performance --20 revised QC or quality control policy that requires 20 21 Α. No. 21 that no results, positive or negative, are released 22 -- problems? She was a satisfactory 22 Q. if quality control is not acceptable. This must 23 23 also detail a corrective action plan for when there employee? 24 A. Yes, she was. 24 are QC failures. 25 25 All right. And in response to what Do you see that? Page 72

Page 70 Α. Yes.

> 2 And it was in response to that that

you told CAP that you would no longer use 3

says: OK, that is what I thought and was worried 4

when she called me asking about it. I would not 5 A. The submit or revise policy, they wanted to make sure that our policy had indicated

feel comfortable reporting something out if it is

Ms. Diloretta said where she said we never get the

and have to just report what we can, Ms. Essington

time to properly investigate and get a root cause

7 clear there is an issue.

8 Do you see that?

9 A. I do.

3

10 Q. Okay. And she said that in response

to Ms. Diloretta saying we just have to report what

we can because we don't get the time to properly

13 investigate?

888-893-3767

14 A. That's not the full context.

15 She says --

16 No, if you start from the top, where

17 Christina Essington started the communication,

18 right, this was when we were reporting out test

results. We wanted to ensure in the database that 19

20 we weren't reporting out 6-MAM, we were reporting

21 out the other drugs within that metabolite.

22 Q. Okay. Whatever -- whatever that was,

23 Ms. Essington says after -- after Ms. Diloretta

says we -- we don't get the time, we never get the

time to properly investigate and get a root cause

historical QCs, correct?

that positives would not be released, didn't have

the words "negative." So they wanted to make sure

9 that our written policy stated no positives or

10 negatives.

15

11 Q. But it was in response to this that

you changed the policy to provide that you would no

13 longer use historical QCs, correct?

14 A. Correct.

Q. And CAP also told you, if you look at

16 the next bullet down, they wanted you to submit --

or they insisted you submit an evaluation and

corrective actions for all external proficiency

19 testing for urine, oral fluid, and hair testing

20 that must include corrective actions for all

21 qualitative and qualitative [sic] results that are

22 less than the highest rating, or outside of a

23 standard deviation index of plus or minus 2.0 or

24 any hair test result rated as questionable or

25 unsatisfactory.



Page: 19 of 111 July 09, 2024 Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Pagel Dominique Delagnes

Pagel Dominique Delagnes July 09, 2024								
1	Correct?	Page 73	1	Q.	Page 75 You do you think so you didn't			
2	A. Yes.		2		ould be important that anybody would know			
3			3		had been placed on probation?			
4	- ,		4	•	We still had our CAP accreditation.			
5	, ,		5	Q.	Dr. Riley didn't know that at that			
6	right? A. Yes.		6		t CAP [sic] was on probation, did she?			
7		CAB	7		MR. CEJAS: Objection. Calls for			
1 -		CAF	8		ion to what Dr. Riley knew or didn't know.			
8	told you to do, correct? A. Yes.		9	•	Subject to that, go ahead.			
-			10	•	THE WITNESS: I don't know.			
11	10 Q. And wasn't that one of Dr. Riley's		11	0	(BY MR. CORNFELD) You know you			
12	complaints? A. What wasn't one of what?		12		r testimony in the Michigan case, correct?			
			13	A.	Correct.			
13	. , ,		14	Q.	She did not mention that as a result			
14 15								
	, and the second se		15 16	•				
16	•	ie use	17	•				
18	17 of historical QCs?		18	I don't r				
19			19		And you didn't mention that in your			
20	•	nd that	20		ny in Michigan, did you?			
21	•		21		I did not.			
22		iteu,	22		MR. PLEBAN: That's yours.			
23	·		23		(A discussion was held off the			
24		tvou	24	record.)				
25		- 1	25	Q.	(BY MR. CORNFELD) Handing you			
	alan t como back to allo imolligan jaagee a							
1	Michigan state officials after you told them you	Page 74	1	handing	Page 76 you what's been marked as Exhibit 50. Do			
2		ions	2	_	that this is a the transcript of			
3			3	testimon	y that you gave in a case in in the			
4			4	court in	Ingham County, Michigan?			
5	A. We did not. Had we had improperly		5	A.	Yes.			
6	reported test results, we would have gone ba	ck and	6	Q.	And that's the case in which both you			
7	updated our test results.		7	and Dr. I	Riley testified?			
8	Q. My my question was		8	A.	Yes.			
9	A. We did not. I answered that as no,		9	Q.	And that that you gave that			
10	we did not		10	testimor	ny on February 5th, 2021, correct?			
11	MR. CORNFELD: Okay. I move		11	A.	Yes.			
12	THE WITNESS: and I added on to		12	Q.	And so you knew at that time that CAP			
13			13	had plad	ced Averhealth on probation, didn't you?			
14	MR. CORNFELD: I move I move to		14	A.	Yes.			
15	strike the rest of the answer after we did not as		15	Q.	This case was on a motion by a mother			
16	nonresponsive to the question.		16	to supp	ress Averhealth's test results that came			
17	Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Did you tell		17	•	sitive for illegal drugs, right?			
18	•	I	18	A.	Yes.			
19	Averhealth on probation because it found		19	Q.	Because she said it was a false			
20	Dr. Riley's allegations were substantiated?		20	•	, correct?			
21	A. We did not, because we were still ar	1	21	A.	She yes, that the test results			
22	•		22	_	ot accurate.			
23	•	the	23	Q.	If you turn to page 4, beginning			
24	website, it still showed that we had our CAP		24	A.	4?			



25

Q. Page 4, yes. It's where the

25 accreditation.

888-893-3767

Page: 20 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 77 Page 79 transcript, beginning at line 7, you were asked: allegations of Dr. Riley's were substantiated. 2 While being the chief operating officer -- meaning 2 correct? the chief of Averhealth -- have concerns been 3 3 Α. Yes. brought to Averhealth that there have been some 4 And -- and your testimony was that Q. 5 concerns in regard to the accuracy of drug testing? 5 her -- her allegations were completely not 6 And your answer was: There have. substantiated, correct? 6 7 Can you give the Court an idea of 7 My exact quote in here was --8 what the concerns were and what happened? 8 Your exact quote was: Since that 9 Your answer: Sure. So we have an 9 time, you know, they've been completely not 10 employee that was employed for us for less than six substantiated. 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6

weeks, who was disgruntled, and upon her departure 11 12 had made claims that Averhealth had some quality

13 issues. And since that time, you know, they've

been completely not substantiated. 14

15 Do you see that testimony?

16 A. I do.

17 Q. At this point in time, CAP had told

you that those claims, those allegations were 18

substantiated, correct? 19

20 A. This testimony indicates the fact

21 that she was -- that Dr. Riley was indicating that

22 our test results were wrong 30 percent of the time.

That's what I was speaking to here. Those had not 23

24 been substantiated.

25 You didn't --

A.

Page 78 CAP did not say that our results were

were substantiated, correct?

statement, didn't you?

Yes.

Yes.

Yes.

Correct?

Yes, that is --

Completely was your word in that

And you -- and then you said: And

we've had other independent individuals look at our

processes and basically not come to the same

the testing that is being done by Averhealth.

conclusion that there were any quality issues with

And you made that -- you made that

Knowing that CAP was an independent

Page 80

Α.

Q.

A.

Α.

Q.

Α.

answer, correct?

wrong. 2 3 You didn't mention that -- that that Q.

was the -- what you were talking about. You

5 were -- you were asked what were the concerns and

6 what happened, and you knew at that time that

Dr. Riley's concerns, she had sent her concerns to 7

CAP, those four bullet points we've looked at

several times, and CAP found they were

10 substantiated, correct?

11 There's a letter that talks about

12 them being substantiated. What I'm reflecting

13 to --

1

14 O Excuse me --

15 -- here is the fact --

16 Excuse me --Q.

17 Α. Yes.

That's all -- that was all my 18 Q.

19 question.

20 Α. Okay.

21 Q. Which that question was.

22 Yes. Yes. Α.

23 And when you say there was a letter,

you're referring to the letter that CAP had just 24

25 sent you a week earlier telling you that those body that found that Dr. Riley's four allegations

3 A. What I was referring to here --

4 I'm not talking about --

5 MR. CEJAS: Wait --

Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) -- what you're

referring to, I'm talking about what you were --

what you knew when you said that other -- other

9 independent individuals came to the same

conclusion. You knew that CAP had found that

11 Dr. Riley's allegations were substantiated at that

time, didn't you? 12

13 MR. CEJAS: Object to form.

14 Argumentative. And let her answer -- go ahead and

15 answer, Dominique.

16 THE WITNESS: What I was referring to

17 here was Dr. Wagner and Dr. Broussard who came on

site and did an independent investigation. 18

19 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You -- you didn't

mention either Dr. Wagner or Broussard in that 20

21 answer, did you?

22 A. I did not.

23 And you didn't feel the need to tell

24 the Court that your accrediting body, the College

of American Pathologists, had found that



Page: 21 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 81 Page 83 Dr. Riley's four allegations were substantiated; is A. It is not a false because they did 1 2 that right? 2 3 A. CAP had come -- had --3 You didn't -- you didn't refer to --Excuse me, my question was: You 4 You're right, I didn't. didn't feel the need to tell the Court that CAP had 5 -- you did not refer to that --Q. found that Dr. Riley's four allegations were 6 That is correct. substantiated at the time you gave your 7 Q. You referred to her allegations, testimony --8 her -- the claims she made about quality issues.

9 A. I did not --10 Q. -- in Michigan?

11 A. -- mention this on the stand, no.

12 Q. So is it your belief that when you

13 told the Court that Dr. Riley's allegations were

completely not substantiated, you were not telling 14

15 a fib to the Court?

16 A. Dr. Riley was stating on the record 17 that our test results were wrong 30 or --

30 percent of the time or more, and so --18

19 Q. My question is --

20 A. -- and so what I was responding to

21 was the fact that she was making allegations that

22 our test results were wrong 30 percent of the time.

23 CAP did not find that to be the case. In fact, as

part of their investigation, they came on, and one

of the things they were looking at --

not find the fact that our test results were wrong.

and CAP had found them substantiated, and you told 9

the Court that they had been completely not 10

11 substantiated, correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 Take a look at page 12. You were --

14 vou were asked, referring to a memoranda that the other lawyer had been using, you were asked: Now, 15

16 the memorandum that the prosecutor was reading to

17 you goes on to say that in addition -- I'm quoting

now, and he quotes -- in addition, we have informed 18

-- been informed that allegations have been raised

regarding Averhealth's -- Averhealth employee 20

21 practices not complying with the company's

22 accreditation standard, unquote. What do you say

23 to that?

24 And your answer was: There has been 25 nothing that has said that we are not following our

Page 82

Q. That wasn't my --

2 A. -- to see --

3 Q. Excuse me --

4 MR. CEJAS: Just a minute --

5 MR. CORNFELD: Excuse me, that is not

6 responsive.

1

7 MR. CEJAS: It is responsive --

8 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) That happened --

9 that happened in May, and we will get to that.

We're talking about your testimony in February when 10

11 you said that Dr. Riley's allegations had been

completely not substantiated. Is it your testimony

13 that that -- is it your testimony today that that

14 was not false?

15 MR. CEJAS: Object to form.

16 Argumentative.

17 Go ahead and answer the question.

THE WITNESS: I don't -- that was a 18 19 double negative, so I'm now very confused what

20 you're asking me.

21 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Is it -- is it --

22 are you telling us that that testimony that you

23 gave when you said that her allegations had been

found to be completely not substantiated, that that 24

25 was not a falsehood you told the Court?

Page 84 standards. We do -- our employees do follow our

2 SOPs on a consistent basis.

3 Do you see that that was your

4 answer --

5

6

12

20

Α. Yes.

-- to that question?

7 And you didn't tell the Court when

you said that nothing -- nothing has said that we

are not following our standards and your employees

follow your SOPs, when you talked about the

11 standards, you're referring to your SOPs, correct?

13 And you did not mention that CAP had 14 found that you had failed to follow procedures as

15 written. You didn't tell the Court that, did you?

16 Α. No.

17 Instead, you said nothing has been said that our employees aren't following our 18 19 standards, correct?

A. Yes.

21 MR. CEJAS: Objection.

22 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Is it your

23 testimony that that -- that your -- your testimony

today that what you told the Court in February of 24

25 2021 was not false?



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 22 of 111

Page Dominion Delagnes

July 09, 2024 Page 85 Page 87 1 A. I'm --Court knew and didn't know. 2 2 When you said nothing -- nothing has Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You -- you know --3 been said that we are not following our standards, you've read the Court's opinion, haven't you? 3 4 when CAP said you weren't following your standards. 4 I have read the Court's opinion. 5 What -- what -- strike that. 5 And the Court didn't mention anything 6 MR. PLEBAN: I think it was a double 6 about CAP finding -- putting you on probation or -or finding that Dr. Riley's allegations were negative. Sorry. 8 MR. CORNFELD: That's okay. You 8 substantiated, did it? 9 They did not state that in their 9 don't have to explain. 10 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) When -- when you 10 opinion, no. told the Court in Michigan -- after CAP had found 11 Q. And so you would conclude from that 11 12 that you failed to follow your procedures as that the Court didn't know about. The Court 12 written, when you told the Court there's been 13 reviewed all the testimony, all the evidence before nothing that said that we are not following our 14 it, correct? 14 15 standards, and our employees follow our SOPs on a 15 Α. I believe so. 16 consistent basis, is it your testimony today that 16 Q. Okay. 17 you were telling the Court the truth when you did 17 They also made their ruling based on not mention that CAP had found that you weren't testimony that was given by Dr. Wagner, who was 18 18 19 following your standards? 19 also on there, who had come to our laboratory and 20 At this time, that is -- this is what 20 done an inspection to show that our test results 21 I said. 21 were accurate. 22 22 Q. We'll get to -- we'll get to You were asked whether anybody had Dr. Wagner. 23 found that you were not following your standards. 23 You know that -- you knew that CAP had found that 24 Α. Okay. 25 you were not following your standards and you said 25 Do you think Dr. Wagner would take --Page 86 Page 88 get more weight than CAP, than your accrediting there's been nothing that has said we are not 1 following our standards. That's what you told the 2 2 body? 3 Court, correct? 3 Our accrediting body didn't say our Α. 4 A. Yes. results were wrong. 4 5 Okay. And that wasn't true, was it? 5 Excuse me, your -- what your --It wasn't true that nothing has said that we are 6 But our accrediting body didn't say not following our standards because CAP said you our results were wrong. 7 8 weren't following your standards, correct? Your accrediting body -- excuse me, 9 There is documentation from CAP that 9 do you believe that Dr. Wagner carries more weight than CAP? 10 says that we did not follow our SOPs as written, 10 11 ves. 11 A. I don't know how to quantify that. 12 Q. So -- so -- so what -- so you're --12 Do you know what happened to the --13 and so what you told the Court was not true? 13 to the woman who brought that case? Did she lose a 14 Α. Correct. 14 child as a result of this proceeding? 15 15 Q. And the Court took that into A. I don't know what happened. consideration when it -- when it reached its 16 Presumably, that is what happened 16 17 decision in the case, the Court had your testimony 17 because she was claiming that -- that the drug test and considered that testimony, and the Court had no was false, and this was a child custody proceeding. 18 18 way of knowing what CAP had found because nobody 19 19 You know that --20 told the Court, correct? 20 A. In Michigan, they --

21 Q. -- because --22

MR. CEJAS: Let me --

THE WITNESS: Okay. 23

24 MR. CEJAS: -- object to form. It

25 assumes facts not in evidence.



MR. CEJAS: Well, objection. Calls

THE WITNESS: I don't know what the

for speculation to what the Court knew or didn't

21

22

23

24

25

know.

Go ahead.

July 09, 2024

Page: 23 of 111 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 89 Page 91 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You know -- you has shown that our test results are not accurate. know that from the title of the case, and I don't Q. I'm not asking you, and you said I want to read the names of -- of the children, and I 3 don't know how many umpteen times that you believe don't know why it was produced to us with the names vour tests are not -- are not inaccurate, and of the children not redacted. And it will be in that's something that the jury will decide based on the record, but you -- strike that. 6 all of the evidence in the case. 7 A. In Michigan --7 My question is about this lawsuit 8 Excuse me. This was -- this was a 8 that -case that was in the matter of two minor children. 9 Α. Okav. 10 correct? 10 Q. -- you testified in. Do you have any 11 A. Correct. idea what this case could have been about other 11 12 than a woman bringing a case over the custody of And they were the minor children of 12 13 the woman who said that her -- her test was wrong 13 her two minor children? 14 and she wasn't using drugs, correct? 14 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. 15 MR. CEJAS: Well, objection. Assumes Argumentative, again calls for speculation. 15 16 facts not in evidence, calls for speculation. 16 But go ahead, if you know. 17 17 But if you know, go ahead. THE WITNESS: I don't know. 18 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 18 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You've been handed 19 (BY MR. CORNFELD) You don't know 19 what's been marked as Exhibit 51, which is a letter 20 anything to the contrary. I mean, you know that -on Averhealth's letterhead to Lena Portillo of CAP 20 21 you know that a woman brought this proceeding 21 dated February 25, '21, from Dr. Glinn with a re 22 22 line: Requested Documentation. claiming that her test was inaccurate, and the 23 23 proceeding was in the matter of two minor children. Do you see that? 24 Wouldn't you conclude that those were her minor 24 A. Yes. 25 children? 25 And Dr. Glinn states: In the letter Page 90 Page 92 of January 29, 2021, CAP has requested the 1 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Calls 2 following documentation. 2 for speculation. Again, it assumes facts not in Correct? 3 evidence. 3

4 But go ahead, if you know.

5 THE WITNESS: And there's nothing 6 that shows that our test results were inaccurate. Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Excuse me. That's 7

8 not my question. My question is: You would 9 conclude from the name of the case and the fact

10 that a woman brought the case, that the case

11 involved her custody over her two minor children,

12 correct?

13 MR. CEJAS: Same objections.

14 THE WITNESS: I don't know the case.

15 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Do you have any

16 other idea what this case might have been, if a

17 woman brought the case claiming the test results

were inaccurate and it was a case that involved her 18

19 two minor children?

20 A. You keep talking about our tests

21 being inaccurate --

22 Q. Excuse me.

23 -- but you don't allow me to --

24 Q. Excuse me.

25 -- respond to the fact that nothing

4 Α. Yes.

Q. And then she provides four items of

documentation or information. And the first one is

a detailed explanation of when and how historical

calibration curves and/or historical quality

9 controls are used.

10 Do you see that?

A. Yes.

11

17

18

12 Q. And -- and in answer to that item,

13 Dr. Glinn says that Averhealth had changed its

14 procedures to stop using historical quality

controls and to use historical calibrators only 15

16 within the past 24 hours, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And in item number 2, Dr. Glinn

states that in response to Aver -- CAP's demand. 19

Averhealth had changed its procedures on 20

21 chromatography, correct?

22 We didn't change what we were doing,

we updated the written documentation about how it 23

was being done. So the practice stayed in place,

25 we just further defined it.



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 24 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 93 Page 95 Q. Regarding -- regarding beforehand. It's something that Mr. Herzog put 2 chromatography, correct? together. I believe it's the first time that I'm 3 reading it, but I could take a look at it. Α. Yes. 4 Q. And in response to number 3, 4 Q. Well, would you -- would you read that to yourself? And then I just have a couple 5 regarding quantitative bias as shown in the CAP 5 questions about it. proficiency testing in 2019, and the correction 6 7 A. Sure. Okay. action -- corrective action plan for bias, you submitted a corrective action plan, correct? 8 Does -- does reading this memo. A. We'd already been looking at it, but Exhibit 52, refresh your recollection about it? 9 9 10 they wanted us to further give a graphical 10 A. Again, I don't believe I saw this 11 representation, which we provided. beforehand. Mr. Herzog didn't share every memo 11 12 Q. All right. And that was in response 12 with me before it was sent out to individuals. I 13 to what they wanted, correct? honestly don't think he ever had me edit it, look 14 A. Yes. 14 at it, or review it before it was sent. 15 Q. And they also wanted a revised QC 15 Q. All right. You -- you know from 16 policy that required that no results, positive or 16 having just read it that Mr. Herzog is writing to 17 negative, would be released if QC is not 17 Judge Boyd about the testimony that Dr. Riley gave acceptable, and you provided that, correct? in the same court in which you testified, and her 18 19 We updated our policy so it clearly testimony was after yours. It was on February 20 19th, 2021. 20 stated both positive and negative, yes. So they 21 asked for additional --21 A. Yes. 22 22 Q. He doesn't mention -- strike that. Q. Excuse me. 23 23 At this time, Averhealth was under Α. -- document -- written documentation. 24 probation by CAP, correct? MR. CORNFELD: How long have we been 24 25 going? 25 Yes. Was on probation by CAP and Page 94 Page 96 1 MR. CEJAS: We are -still CAP accredited, yes. 2 MR. PLEBAN: Right at about two. 2 Q. I didn't ask about that. I just 3 MR. CEJAS: Yeah, we're right about 3 asked at this time, Averhealth was on probation from CAP, correct? two hours total. 4 4 5 5 A. Yes. MR. PLEBAN: Are you at a breaking 6 6 point? He doesn't mention that to Judge 7 MR. CORNFELD: Yeah, why don't do Bovd. does he? 7 8 that. 8 Α. No. 9 MR. PLEBAN: Let's take a break. 9 Q. This is after he had written Judge 10 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Time is 10:58 a.m. Boyd in November and said that he was confident 11 We are off the record. that CAP would find that the allegations of 12 (A short break was taken.) 12 Dr. Riley were unsubstantiated, correct? 13 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 11:18. 13 I have not seen that either. 14 We're back on the record. 14 We saw that -- we saw that yesterday. 15 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You have in front 15 Okay. Which document was that that

of you Exhibit 52, which is a memo on the 16

17 letterhead of Averhealth by Jason Herzog,

Averhealth President and CEO, to Judge Boyd of 18

Michigan with the -- with the subject Sarah Riley, 19

20 February 19, 2020, testimony?

21 A. 2021 testimony?

22 2021, yes. Q.

23 Α. Yes.

Are you familiar with this memo? 24 Q.

25 I am not. I didn't read it

he -- I apologize, I don't recall seeing that memo. 16

17 We've seen a lot of documents.

Q. I think it's Exhibit 40.

19 A. Yes. Okay. Yes, I remember the

20 accuracy of test results. Thank you. It is

21 Exhibit 40.

18

22 Q. And -- and he -- in Exhibit 40, on

November 12, 2020, Mr. Herzog told Judge Boyd of 23

the Michigan Supreme Court: We are confident that 24

25 CAP-FDT will deem the allegations as



Page: 25 of 111 Page Dominion Delagnes July 09, 2024 Page 97 Page 99 unsubstantiated. that CAP had found that Dr. Riley's allegations 2 Correct? were substantiated, after having told him three 3 A. Correct. 3 4 Q. As of the -- and -- and he states: find them substantiated, is that in keeping with Perhaps unlike others, we fully embrace 5 Averhealth's philosophy of transparency? 5 transparency and self-report our mistakes. 6 A. Yes. 6 7 Correct? 7 Q. And you don't think that Judge Boyd

9

14

15

8 A. Correct.

Q. As of when Mr. -- strike that.

10 As of when Mr. Herzog wrote his memo

to Judge Boyd on February 26th, 2021, Exhibit 52, 11

12 CAP had told Averhealth that it deemed Dr. Riley's

13 four allegations to be substantiated, correct?

A. They cited that four -- yes.

Okay. And Mr. Herzog didn't tell

16 Judge Boyd that even though he had three months

17 earlier said he would -- he was confident that they

would find the allegations unsubstantiated, 18

19 correct?

20 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Calls

21 for speculation to what he told to the extent

22 you're asking about something that's beyond this

23 piece of paper, so I think it's overbroad.

24 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go ahead.

25 Can you repeat the last part of the months earlier that he was confident they would not

would have appreciated learning that what Dr. --

Mr. Herzog told him three months earlier was not

borne out when CAP issued its findings? 10

11 MR. CEJAS: Object to form.

12 Speculation.

13 THE WITNESS: What was not substantiated was the fact that our test results 14

15 were incorrect.

16 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Excuse me. The 17 allegations that he was referring to in his memo of

November, which were the four allegations that CAP

19 had brought against Averhealth based on what

Dr. Riley had told it -- told CAP --

A. In addition to our result --

Excuse me. Excuse me. Those were

23 the allegations that Judge Boyd was referring to in

24 his memo to Judge -- excuse me, that those are the

25 allegations that Mr. Herzog was referring to when

Page 98

20

21

22

6

9

11

question?

2 MR. CORNFELD: Could you read it

3 back, please?

4 (The following question was read

5 back: Q. Okay. And Mr. Herzog didn't tell

Judge Boyd that even though he had three months

7 earlier said he would -- he was confident that they

8 would find the allegations unsubstantiated,

9 correct?)

10 MR. CEJAS: Same objections.

11 THE WITNESS: In this letter, he

12 did -- he did not state that, no.

13 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) And -- and by that

14 letter, you're referring to the memo --

15 A. The February 26th, 2021.

16 Q. Exhibit 52?

17 Α. Correct.

18 Is that in keeping with the

transparency that Mr. Herzog told Judge Boyd 19

20 Averhealth believes it lives up to?

21 We were still -- had our CAP

22 certification and continued to report accurate test

23 results.

24 Q. My -- my question is: Not telling

Judge Boyd when you wrote him in February of 2021

Page 100 he wrote Judge Boyd in November 2020, correct?

2 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Calls

3 for speculation as to what someone else is

4 referring to.

5 Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: In addition to

referring to the fact that she was saying that our

8 results --

Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) No --

10 A. -- were wrong 30 percent of the time.

Q. My -- my -- he did not say that in

12 his -- in his memo to Judge Boyd in November. He

13 said -- he didn't say anything about Dr. Riley

14 saying that the results were wrong 30 percent of

the time, did he? 15

16 A. He said that --

17 Did he say that -- that Dr. Riley was

18 claiming that the results were wrong 30 percent of

19 the time?

20 A. He was stating that she had made 21 allegations, which she made publicly to CAP --

22 Did he --

23 -- to the state of Michigan and to

the DOJ that our results were wrong 30 percent of

25 the time. And when we are talking about --



Page: 26 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 101 Page 103 Q. Did he -- did he mention that to 1 A. No. 2 2 Judge Boyd in November of 2021? Q. All right. There were four 3 A. I -- he did not use the words wrong 3 allegations Dr. -- excuse me, Mr. Herzog addressed those in his memo to Judge Boyd in November 2020, 4 30 percent of the time. and when he had the occasion to send him another 5 Q. Or anything to that effect. He 5 didn't even allude to 30 percent of the time, did memo after CAP had found those allegations 6 6 7 he? substantiated, he didn't -- he concealed that from 8 A. It says made allegations regarding Judge Boyd. He did not mention that, correct? test methods. 9 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. 9 10 Q. Right. And those were the four 10 Argumentative to conceal, calls for speculation. allegations that CAP wrote you in November of 2020, 11 Go ahead. 11 and those allegations didn't say that the test 12 THE WITNESS: He did not mention it, 12 13 results were wrong 30 percent of the time, did 13 correct. What he did mention on here --14 they? 14 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Excuse me, vou've 15 On that document, no. I have not 15 answered the question. There's no question Α. 16 seen the full allegation that was written from 16 pending. Dr. Riley to CAP. I don't know that she put in 17 MR. CEJAS: That's a highlighted there that that led to -- I don't know what was in 18 18 copy. 19 there. 19 MR. CORNFELD: Oh, my gosh, I am 20 Q. Right. What you know is what CAP 20 hopeless. 21 told you about, and they didn't say anything about 21 (BY MR. CORNFELD) I'm handing you 22 30 percent of the time, did they? what is marked as Exhibit 53, which is an e-mail 22 23 A. They did not, no. 23 from Jason Herzog to Jarrad Wagner, Amanda Doane, 24 They --24 and Colin Parks dated February 26, 2021, and has a Q. 25 They did --Bates number on the first page of 43819. Page 102 Page 104 1 Q. -- listed --Do you have that? A. -- they did found our results as 2 2 Α. I do. 3 accurate, though, through inspections with us. 3 Q. Have you seen this before? 4 Q. We'll get to that. Α. I'm not sure. 4 5 A. Okay. 5 Would you read through it and --Q. 6 6 Q. We're talking about November of 2020. I am. They hadn't done an inspection at that time, so why Q. Okay. 7 do you keep bringing that up when we are talking I don't believe I have seen this, I 8 9 about what CAP told you in November of 2020? 9 don't recall. 10 10 (A discussion was held off the MR. CEJAS: Object to --11 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) They didn't --11 record.) 12 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 12 excuse me -- that --13 MR. CEJAS: Well, you're not going 13 (BY MR. CORNFELD) You've been handed 14 to --14 what's been marked as Exhibit 54, which appears to

15 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) -- inspection --

MR. CEJAS: -- raise your voice at 16

17 the witness, Rick.

18 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) -- that --

19 MR. CEJAS: You can ask your

20 question --

21 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) -- that

22 inspection --

23 MR. CEJAS: -- lower the voices.

Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) That inspection 24

25 hadn't happened yet, had it? 15 be a slide deck to the Michigan Prosecutor's

Association on April 21, 2021. 16

17 Correct.

> Q. Have you seen this before?

19 Yes. Α.

18

20

Q. What -- what is this?

21 This was information that we provided

22 to the Michigan Prosecutor's Association. It was a

23 slide deck about Averhealth, who we are.

24 Okay. And this -- this was -- was

25 this in a meeting?



Page: 27 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 105 Page 107 A. Not -- I'm not sure. I was going to 1 Correct. 2 say not a meeting that I participated in, but I'm 2 Was that in keeping with Averhealth's not sure. I don't recall. I know we put this philosophy of transparency? 3 3 4 together. 4 We were still a CAP-accredited 5 laboratory. Q. Were you part of the team that put 5 this together? I shouldn't say "team." Did you 6 6 Q. I -- I'm -- I'm sorry, my question 7 participate in putting this together? is: Not telling the prosecutors that CAP had been 8 I definitely reviewed it. put on probation and that CAP had found that 9 Q. All right. And the reason that 9 Dr. Riley's allegations were substantiated, was 10 prosecutors were interested in Averhealth was that that in keeping with Averhealth's philosophy of 10 11 they would use Averhealth's test results in their transparency? 11 12 cases, correct? 12 A. And I --13 A. Yes. 13 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Assumes 14 And so they had to have confidence facts not in evidence. It says all allegations. 14 15 that you were doing the tests properly, correct? I'm objecting to form. 15 16 Α. Yes. 16 Go ahead. THE WITNESS: Okay. And as I 17 17 Q. If you turn to page 5 entitled Timeline of Events. answered, we were still a CAP-accredited 18 18 19 Do you see that? 19 laboratory. Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) I -- my question 20 Yes. 20 Α. 21 And this shows events from 21 is: Was not telling the prosecutors so that they November 2020, December 2020, and January 2020, 22 22 wouldn't know because it wasn't public, that CAP 23 correct? 23 had put you on probation and found that the 24 A. Yes. And that must be a typo, should allegations were substantiated, was that in keeping 25 be January 2021. with Averhealth's philosophy of transparency? Page 106 Page 108 1 Q. Okay. And there are two events 1 We still had accurate test results. listed for January 2021, correct? My question is: Was that in keeping 2 2 3 A. Yes. 3 with Averhealth's philosophy of transparency? 4 The first is -- relates to the Wagner 4 That's a yes-or-no question. 5 Toxicology Associates' evaluation of Averhealth, 5 Α. Yes. correct? 6 Q. Thank you. And do you believe that 6 7 A. Yes. withholding information is transparent? We weren't withholding information. 8 Q. And the second is the statement facts 8 9 proved that the allegations have no basis, correct? 9 You withheld the information that CAP 10 Α. Yes. had put you on probation and had found that 10

11 Q. Are that -- is that referring to

12 Dr. Riley's allegations?

13 A. Her allegations about our test 14 results being wrong 30 percent of the time.

15 Do you mention that she said they

were wrong 30 percent of the time? 16

17 A. No, we do not.

18 No. So it's just her -- you just

refer to allegations in general, correct? 19

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. Something you didn't mention in here

22 that happened in January 2021 is CAP putting you on

23 probation and finding that the allegations -- the

four allegations she made to it, that they reported 24

25 to you were substantiated, correct? Dr. Riley's allegations were -- were substantiated

and that at this time, you were making corrections

13 to those -- to those practices that CAP was

14 investigating, correct?

MR. CEJAS: Object to form --

16 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You didn't tell --

17 you didn't tell the prosecutors any of that, did

18 you?

15

22

23

25

19 MR. CEJAS: Object to form.

20 Argumentative and compound.

21 Go ahead.

> THE WITNESS: We were updating procedures to outline what we -- what practices we

were actually doing. 24

Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) That was



Page: 28 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 109 Page 111 number, which has the prefix MICH, this is correcting the practices, correct? 1 2 It was -something we actually received from the Michigan Α. 3 Department of Health and Human Services, so it's Q. Wasn't that --4 -- updating our procedures to outline not surprising that this was in their files, is it? 5 5 and better define it. It wasn't correcting the --No, because I'd indicated it probably the practices. was sent to Amanda Doane, who works at MDHHS. 6 7 And she would have distributed it to 7 Q. Well, we'll get to -- to all the 8 people you later told that you had corrected your the people who would be interested in Averhealth's testing, correct? 9 practices. 10 10 A. I don't know whether to assume where A. Okay. 11 11 she would have sent it to. I'm not sure. I --Q. But you weren't correcting your Q. But you -- you would have expected 12 practices and you did not tell --12 13 We were updating our practices. 13 her to do that when you sent it to her, correct? 14 Correct. 14 -- you didn't tell -- whether it was updating your procedures or --15 Q. And if you look at page 5, that has 15 16 Correct. 16 the same page of timeline of events that we just 17 -- correcting your practices --17 saw in the prosecutor's slide decks, correct? 18 Α. Correct. 18 You are correct --19 MR. CEJAS: Objection --19 And this is actually a month earlier. 20 This is March 2021, correct? Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) -- you didn't --20 you didn't tell the prosecutors any of that, did 21 21 Correct. 22 22 vou? At a time when Averhealth was on 23 probation. And once again, the events of January 23 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. It's 24 2020, and it's -- I guess it's a -- it's another 24 argumentative, it's asked and answered. 25 Go ahead. typo, with the same typo. It should be Page 110 Page 112 1 THE WITNESS: Correct. January 2021? 2 2 Yes. Thank you. A. 3 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You've been handed 3 It lists the same two items we saw in what's been marked as Exhibit 55, which is a slide the prosecutor's slide deck and does not mention 4 5 program -- or appears to be a slide program anything about CAP or the CAP probation or the CAP entitled MDHHS Update March 2021. finding that Dr. Riley's four allegations were 6 7 Do you see that? 7 substantiated, correct? 8 A. Yes. 8 A. Correct. 9 Are you familiar with this? 9 And it -- it states on the right: No 10 A. Yes. other lab has been so thoroughly evaluated, 10 11 Q. What is this? 11 affording you trust and confidence in Averhealth 12 This is a document that we provided 12 drug test results. 13 an update back to MDHHS in March of 2021. 13 Do you see that? 14 And if you -- if you would look at 14 Α. Yes. 15 page 5. 15 Well, that -- those evaluations 16 included the one by CAP, correct? A. Yes. 16

17 Q. What -- I'm sorry, before I ask you

about this, was this done in a live presentation?

A. I don't recall. 19

20 Q. All right. Who was it sent to?

21 A. I don't recall. My guess is that it

22 would have gone to Amanda Doane --

23 All right. And --

24 -- and Colin Parks. Α.

25 -- and you can see by the Bates 17 Α. Yes.

Maybe the most thorough of all of the 18 Q.

19 evaluations --

20 MR. CEJAS: Objection --

21 THE WITNESS: And they didn't find

22 our --

23 (BY MR. CORNFELD) Excuse me.

24 A. -- test results wrong.

25 Excuse me. It was maybe the most



Page: 29 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 113 Page 115 thorough of all the evaluations, correct? 1 Q. You didn't know -- well, at the time 2 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Calls 2 meaning -- you mean at the time that -- that MDHHS for speculation, vague. dropped Averhealth? 3 4 Go ahead. 4 A. When they stopped using our 5 THE WITNESS: I don't -- most of the 5 laboratory for testing services. 6 inspections that we've had have been very thorough. 6 Q. Yes. Is that what you're referring 7 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) And -- and you to when you said you didn't know it at the time? didn't mention the CAP investigation when you said 8 Correct. in Exhibit 55 -- in Exhibit 54, those two slide 9 My question is: Do you think that Q. 10 decks, when you referred to the lab being 10 when the state of Michigan learned that CAP had put 11 thoroughly evaluated, no other lab being so you on probation and had found Dr. Riley's 11 thoroughly evaluated, you didn't mention the CAP allegations substantiated, and that you hadn't told 12 12 13 investigation, did you? them that, even though you claimed to be more 14 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Asked and transparent than other companies, that maybe that 15 answered. played a part when they -- they might have 15 16 Go ahead again. 16 concluded Averhealth can't be trusted, we should 17 THE WITNESS: It just says no other 17 drop them? lab has been thoroughly evaluated. 18 MR. CEJAS: Object --18 19 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) It doesn't say 19 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You think that 20 anything about the CAP investigation? 20 might be the reason why you got dropped? 21 MR. CEJAS: Same objection. 21 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Calls 22 22 Go ahead. for speculation as to the reason for their THE WITNESS: I mean, that would be 23 23 decision. 24 evaluated by CAP, right? I don't understand your 24 Subject to that, go ahead, if you question. 25 25 know. Page 114 Page 116 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't know why 1 (BY MR. CORNFELD) I mean, you 1 mentioned the Wagner investigation, you didn't --2 2 they did. They never told us why. 3 3 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) They never -- they A. Yes. 4 Q. -- you didn't mention the CAP never told you why, but don't you think that 4 5 investigation, did you? companies that are honest and open and above-board 6 A. No, we did not. 6 and truly transparent do better in the business 7 Q. If you were so confident about your area, in the marketplace than companies that have a 7 8 -- well, strike that, 8 reputation for concealing adverse information? 9 You know, a year -- about a year 9 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Vague,

after this, MDHHS suddenly dropped Averhealth as 10

11 its testing laboratory, correct?

12 A. Correct.

13 Michigan did that, the state of

14 Michigan stopped using Averhealth, you had a

15 \$29 million, five-year contract, and they suddenly

16 stopped it in the middle, correct?

A. Correct.

17

At that time, they -- they had 18 Q.

learned about the CAP investigation, hadn't they? 19

20 A. I don't know the time of events of

21 when they learned about it. I believe so from the

22 Department of Justice, yes.

23 Q. Okay.

I didn't know that at the time. I 24

25 know that now.

10 incomplete hypothetical, and overbroad.

Go ahead.

11

12

13

THE WITNESS: That's a very broad question. I don't know how to answer that.

14 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Well, you tell

15 people that you're transparent because you think

16 that will help you in the marketplace, correct?

A. We are transparent. 17

18 Yet, you tell people -- the reason

you tell them you are transparent is to help you 19

20 with your customers so that they'll want to use you

21 more?

22 A. Yes. That's why companies talk about 23 being transparent.

24 Q. And if they learn that you're not

25 transparent, they're liable to drop you and not do



Page: 30 of 111 Page Dominion Delagnes July 09, 2024 Page 117 Page 119 business with you anymore, correct? hurt your business if customers learned about the 2 A. I don't know why MDHHS stopped 2 CAP probation? 3 testing with us. 3 Α. No. 4 MR. CORNFELD: Where did J.C. go? 4 O Then what was the bas- -- business 5 MR. CEJAS: To get food. 5 basis of the decision? 6 THE WITNESS: To get the food. 6 A. It was a business decision not to do 7 MR. CORNFELD: Then let's go off the it, and we've stood by -- as I've said repeatedly, 8 record. we've stood by the accuracy of our test results. Q. Okay. When I hear the term "business 9 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 11:47. 9 10 We are off the record. decision" by a business person --10 11 (A lunch break was taken.) 11 Α. Uh-huh. 12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 12 -- as you were, to me what that means 13 12:40 p.m. We are back on the record. 13 is it would have cost us money. Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Ms. Delagnes, this 14 A. That's your interpretation. That's 14 15 morning, we talked about presentations that 15 not why we did it. 16 Averhealth made to the Michigan prosecutors, to the 16 Q. Okay. What was the business basis of 17 MDHHS, your testimony in that court case, memos 17 the decision? that Mr. Herzog sent to judges in Michigan, and 18 It was a business decision. 18 19 e-mails in which nobody mentioned the CAP 19 I know you said it was a business 20 probation. I want to ask you about -- about why. 20 decision. 21 Why didn't you, if -- if what you 21 A. I know. said today, this morning, if you believed that at 22 22 Q. What was the business basis of the the time -- and you've told us repeatedly -- you've 23 decision? 23 24 insisted that the four allegations that Dr. Riley 24 Because we knew that our test results Α. 25 brought to CAP and that CAP brought to Averhealth 25 were accurate and we were certified the entire Page 118 time, we had our CAP-FDT certification, we made the didn't relate to the quality of the tests -- didn't

relate to the accuracy, I should say, the accuracy

of the tests, and that you were totally confident 3

that your tests were accurate at the time, and were

continuing to be accurate, why didn't you tell all

of your customers and the judges and the

prosecutors and customers that CAP had put

Averhealth on probation in January of 2021 based on

four allegations of Dr. Riley that CAP said were

substantiated, and then list the allegations so 10

11 everybody knows what they are, and then say, "We

are cooperating with CAP in its investigation, none

13 of these allegations relate to the accuracy of our

14 tests, and we are confident about the accuracy of

15 our tests"? Why didn't you tell customers that?

16 Wouldn't that have been truly transparent?

17 A. What we did --

18 No, I -- I know what you did. My

question is: Why didn't you say something like 19

20 what I just outlined? You could have said that,

21 couldn't you?

22 Yes, we could have.

23 Why didn't you?

24 It was a business decision. A.

25 Because you -- you thought it would

business decision not to reveal that.

3 Q. I understand you made a business

decision. 4

5 Α. Okay.

6 But you had to have a basis for that

decision, not just say this is our business

decision. What was the basis of your business

decision? What were the reasons that you made that

10 business decision?

11 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Asked and

12 answered.

13 Go ahead again.

THE WITNESS: Because we knew that 14

our test results were accurate. 15

Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) But if you weren't 16

17 afraid that you would lose business if you were

open about it, about the CAP probation and then 18

19 added --

21

20 A. I disagree with your statement.

-- what I said if you -- my question

22 is: If you didn't believe you would lose business,

23 why wouldn't you tell customers that?

24 Because we still maintained our certification throughout.



Page: 31 of 111 Page Dominion Delagnes July 09, 2024 Page 121 Page 123 MR. CEJAS: She has answered it. You could have told them that, too. Q. 1 2 Okav. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) -- basis of the Α. 3 You could have said, "We are still 3 business decision? Q. certified. They put us on probation; we're still 4 MR. CEJAS: Go ahead one last time. 5 THE WITNESS: Because we maintained 5 certified; we're still doing tests; here are the allegations -- here are the four allegations; they 6 our certification throughout. 6 7 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Did you consider don't relate to the accuracy of the tests, and -and we are confident that our tests are accurate." 8 telling customers what I've just outlined, telling customers, "Based on Dr. Riley's four allegations, 9 If that was what you, in fact, believed at the time, why wouldn't you tell customers that? CAP put us on probation in January of 2021; here 10 11 are those allegations; none of those relate to the A. I've already answered that question. 12 It was a business decision, but I -accuracy of the tests; we are still certified; we 13 I'm waiting to hear the basis of that business are still doing testing; and we are confident that our testing is accurate"? Did you consider telling 14 decision --15 MR. CEJAS: Objection. 15 customers that? 16 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) -- other than you 16 A. At the time, Jason Herzog was our 17 decided to tell them something else. But why? 17 CEO. I'm not trying to pass the buck. It was a business decision that started with him. 18 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Asked 18 19 and answered, argumentative. 19 Q. Did anybody join him in making that 20 business decision? Did you? 20 Go ahead and tell him again. 21 THE WITNESS: It was a business 21 A. I did not. 22 22 decision. So it was Mr. Herzog's and his alone? 23 It was his decision. He was the CEO 23 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Can you not 24 provide any business reasons why you made that 24 of the company. 25 business decision? 25 And -- and so you just -- did you Page 122 Page 124 tell him, you know, "I think we ought to be a 1 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Asked and answered. It's been provided. little more transparent and tell them about the --2 2 3 But go ahead and provide those 3 about the probation," and then add all the other 4 reasons again. things I added in what you could have -- you could 5 THE WITNESS: It was a business have told customers? Did you tell Mr. Herzog you thought that that's what you should tell customers? 6 decision because we maintained our certification 6 7 7 I did not.

throughout.

8 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You could have 9 told them that.

10 A. Okay.

11 Q. I've added to that what you could have told them. So why didn't you -- why didn't 12

you tell them and then be truly transparent and 13

14 they would be impressed that you were transparent?

15 MR. CEJAS: Objection.

16 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Why -- what was

17 the business basis for not doing that?

MR. CEJAS: Objection. Asked and 18

answered three or four times now. One last time 19

20 and then we're going to move on.

21 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go -- go ahead.

22 MR. CORNFELD: I haven't gotten an

23 answer yet.

24 (BY MR. CORNFELD) What is -- what is

25 the --

8 Did you question him in any way?

9 Α. I did not.

10 Q. Why not?

11 He was my boss.

Did he never -- did you never provide

13 advice to him?

12

A. That's a very broad question. Did 14

15 I -- typically, on -- on major business decisions,

no, I did not. 16

17 Thank you.

18 Q. Handing you what's been marked as

19 Exhibit 56 to this deposition. This is an

20 e-mail -- an e-mail thread between you and

21 Dr. Glinn dated January -- Dr. Glinn's e-mail to

you was dated January 9th, 2021, and your response

23 was January 13th, 2021, correct?

24 Give me a minute to read it. I

25 believe -- yes, that's the date on the e-mail.



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 32 of 111

Page Dominique Delagnes July 09, 2024 Page 125 Page 127

Q. Do you recognize it?

2 A. I haven't looked at it since this has 3 been written, but if -- I'm going to take a minute

to go ahead and refresh my memory on it. 4

5 Okay.

> Α. Thank you. Okay. Thank you.

7 Do you recall this?

8 A. I do.

6

9 Q. All right. On January 9th, 2021,

Dr. Glinn initiated this thread by e-mailing you 10

and Christina Essington and Shannon Spencer, 11

12 correct?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Her subject is: List of accessions

15 for Dr. Wagner, correct?

16 Α. Yes.

17 Q. And -- and you recall that Dr. Wagner

wanted to review certain tests, and that you 18

19 provided him a list of test results from which he

20 selected 10 tests for him to review before he

21 arrived, and another 30 for him to review on site,

22 correct?

23 A. Yes.

24 And that was Dr. Wagner's selection

25 based on the test results that you provided him? list, I feel pretty good about this. He may have

done this purposefully, but few of these have any

3 borderline results. They are almost all

numerically substantial, so should not have any

5 issues with background.

6 Do you see that?

7 A. I do.

8 So was she suggesting that Dr. Wagner

9 may have cherry-picked the results to find tests

10 that would be easier to substantiate --

MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Calls --

12 (BY MR. CORNFELD) -- to be easier to

13 verify?

11

18

25

2

14 MR. CEJAS: Calls for speculation as

to what someone else intended. 15

16 Subject to that, go ahead, if you

17 know.

THE WITNESS: I don't know.

19 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Did -- did -- when 20 she says that the -- that few of these have any

21 borderline results, they are almost all numerically

22 substantial so should not have any issues with

23 background, what she's saying is that those would

24 be easier to verify than other tests, correct?

MR. CEJAS: Object to the form.

Page 128

Page 126 We provided him an Excel sheet and he Α. selected tests.

2

3 Q. Okay.

A. Correct.

5 Dr. Glinn starts saying: Hello,

Ladies. I have gone through the list of accessions 6

Dr. Jarrad Wagner would like to review while he is 7

8 here.

1

4

9 So you -- at this point, you had the

10 list of tests that Dr. -- you call -- she calls

them accessions, but they're tests and test reports

that Dr. Wagner was going to review, correct? 12

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Okay. Including there were 10 data

15 packs that were sent to him in advance of his

visit, correct? 16

17 A. Yes.

18 All right. And -- and that's what

she says a couple lines down. She says: The ones 19

20 labeled, quote, litigation, unquote, we will get

21 together and send to him before he comes. The ones

22 labeled on site, he will look at when he gets here.

23 Do you see that?

24 Yes. Α.

25 And then she says: Going through the

Calls for speculation. 1

Go ahead if you know what she meant.

3 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You understood

4 that that's what she meant, didn't you?

5 A. How I read this is her observation

6 was many of them that he picked had high drug

7 concentrations.

8 Q. And -- and they would be easier to

9 verify their accuracy than if they were more

10 borderline, correct?

11 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Calls for

12 speculation. 13

Go ahead if you know what she meant.

14 THE WITNESS: Not easier to verify,

15 no.

correct?

19

16 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Easier -- easier 17 to say those test results were accurate because there wouldn't be an issue with background, 18

20 A. Not with background. No, I disagree.

21 Well, she says she feels pretty good

about this. If you have any -- these have --

23 excuse me, few of these have any borderline

results. They're almost all numerically 24

substantial, so should not have any issues with



Page: 33 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 129 Page 131 background. A. I did not ask her that. 1 2 That's what she said, didn't she? 2 Q. And do you see that she changed one 3 of the results, one of the tests that Dr. Wagner A. It is. 3 4 And didn't you -- or how did you 4 was going to look at? 5 interpret this? 5 Α. I do see that she updated the A. Her observation was that the list 6 6 quantity, yes. 7 that was sent over were test results that had high 7 Q. She said -- she said: There's a THC 8 numeric values. result reported as 1730 that I corrected to -- to 9 Q. That's what she said, but she also 200. 9 10 says that means they're going to have few issues 10 Do you see that? 11 with background, and issues with background 11 A. Yes. 12 would -- might result in the test being inaccurate, 12 Why would she change the results? If 13 correct? 13 Dr. Wagner was coming in to see if your procedures 14 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Calls for were correct and you were reporting accurate 14 15 speculation. results, why would she change a result before 15 16 Go ahead, if you know. 16 Dr. Wagner even got there? 17 THE WITNESS: No, I don't believe 17 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Calls that our test results that are close to the cutoff 18 18 for speculation. 19 would be wrong. I don't agree with that. 19 But go ahead, if you know. 20 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) I understand that. 20 THE WITNESS: I don't know. Either 21 A. I don't agree with that. 21 are still positive for THC. 22 22 Q. I understand because you're standing Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) But Dr. Wagner's 23 23 there standing -- saying you stand behind every not going to be seeing the result as it -- as it 24 single one of the tests Averhealth ever made. 24 was originally tested, is he? 25 Uh-huh. 25 Again, a question for Dr. Glinn. Page 132 Page 130 Q. All right. What -- what about what 1 MR. CEJAS: Is that a yes? 2 THE WITNESS: Yes. she says about false positives on oral fluid 2 3 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Is that true? Is 3 fentanyl tests? 4 4 That's for the -- yes, that's -that true? 5 A. That I stand behind every test result 5 Q. Do you see --6 -- I do. 6 that we ever made? Α. Yes. 7 Do you see she says: Also, it looks 7 Q. 8 A. I stand by the accuracy of our test like our oral fluid fentanvl assav gives some false 9 results. I don't know that I can say every single 9 positives, and maybe with THC, meaning marijuana. 10 test result. I stand by the accuracy of our test Do you see she says that? 10 11 results. 11 A. She's talking about the amino assay 12

12 Q. And -- and -- but if there's the 13 issue with background, and she calls it an issue

14 with background, that makes it more difficult to

15 come up with an accurate result, doesn't it?

Α. That's a question for Dr. Glinn.

17 You're not -- you don't know the

answer to that? 18

16

19 Α. That's an issue to what she meant by 20 this.

21 Did you ask her at the time what do 22 you mean by this? Are you saying that Dr. Wagner

23 might have cherry-picked the -- the tests so that

he'd find tests that would be easier for us to come 24

25 out looking good? test results, yes.

13 Q. How did -- how did she figure that

14 out?

15 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Calls for speculation. 16

17 But if you know, go ahead.

18 THE WITNESS: So there's the ability to look at a specimen that screens positive, and 19 20 then through the confirmation test, ends up being 21 negative. And so we know that in amino assay

testing, there's absolutely interference that's out 22

there. And we know for a fentanyl test, due to the fact that there are certain medications, and it's a 24

low cutoff and small molecules, there is a higher



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 34 of 111

July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 133 Page 135

percentage of those that screen positive by amino

2 assay and confirm negative compared to other amino

assay tests.

Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) This is -- this is

dated on January 9th, 2021. 5

A. Uh-huh. 6

7 Q. And -- and you know that it was -- it

was the test of January 20th, 2021, just a

week-and-a-half later that was the water sample

10 that Tiffani Padilla says she sent in and it got

11 reported as positive for fentanyl?

12 A. And on that test, we did an amino

13 assay screen and an amino -- and a LC-MS/MS

confirmation. What she's referring to here is just

15 the amino assay aspect of the testing.

16 Q. If that had been a false positive on

the amino assay -- assay -- amino acid part of the 17

test, you wouldn't even have gone on to the 18

19 LC-MS/MS part, would you?

20 A. It --

Q. You would have reported it as 21

22 negative, correct?

23 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Incomplete

24 hypothetical and assumes facts not in evidence.

25 But subject to that, go ahead.

> Page 134 THE WITNESS: Can you restate? I

2 don't think you said that correctly. I don't think

your -- your question was how you intended it to 3

4 be.

1

5 Can you repeat his question?

6 (BY MR. CORNFELD) I'll -- I'll --

7 I'll restate it.

8 You said -- say that what Dr. Glinn

9 is talking about on false positives relates to the

10 amino assay screen part of the test, correct?

11 A. Correct.

12 That's the first part of the test

13 that if it's positive, it goes on for -- to the

14 LC-MS/MS, and if it's negative, it gets reported as

15 negative without doing the LC-MS/MS, correct?

16 Α. Correct.

17 Q. So if -- if Tiffani Padilla's test

that she says was water had been a false positive 18

19 but had been reported as -- should have been

20 reported as negative by the amino assay screen,

21 that test never would have gone on to have an

22 LC-MS/MS test, it would have simply been reported

23 as negative, correct?

24 MR. CEJAS: Objection.

25 THE WITNESS: If there was no interaction on the analyzer and it had screened

2 negative, yes, it would have been reported as

negative. But -- but in -- this is not typical to Averhealth itself. It's the reagent that's used

5 for the screening.

6 And as I indicated before, the fact

that for fentanyl, it has cross-reactivity with

certain medications in the amino assay testing, as 8

well as a very low cutoff, and it's a large 9

10 molecule. It's just an industry standard. It's

11 not an Averhealth thing.

12 If you pulled all laboratories that

13 do fentanyl testing, you will see that there's a

higher percentage of specimens that screen positive

and do not confirm. So it has nothing to do with

16 Averhealth's testing, it's the reagent itself.

Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Well, she -- she

goes on to say -- you would think if that were the 18

19 case, Dr. Wagner would be familiar with it and --

20 and would treat it as lightly as you just seemed

21 to.

23

17

22 But do you see that --

MR. CEJAS: Well, I'm --

24 (BY MR. CORNFELD) -- Dr. Glinn

25 states: Our urine fentanyl assay does the same, so

Page 136

not unique to Michigan.

2 And the reason she's referring to

Michigan is because Michigan is only oral fluids, 3

right? 4

9

14

15

16

25

5 MR. CEJAS: Object to the beginning

6 part of that question to form, it calls for

7 speculation --

8 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go ahead.

MR. CEJAS: -- with Dr. Wagner.

10 Go ahead.

11 THE WITNESS: When Dr. Wagner was

there, he was only looking at Michigan specimens.

13 So what she's --

Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) And -- and --

A. Can I finish my --

MR. CEJAS: Let --

MR. CORNFELD: No. 17

18 (BY MR. CORNFELD) In Michigan -- my

question was: Michigan tests were only oral fluid, 19

20 correct?

21 Α. Not correct.

22 They were mainly oral fluid, and what Q.

23 he was looking at was oral fluid, correct?

24 In this particular instance, yes.

All right. And she says: That's



Page: 35 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 137 Page 139 and I did not correct her, but that's really something we can say we are aware of and have 2 2 looked into it. Okay. 3 Did anybody tell Dr. Wagner about 3 -- what is intended in this term is a screen positive. these false positives on the fentanyl test -- the 5 5 Q. You know that Dr. Wagner in his fentanyl --6 report said nothing about false positives on 6 A. Again --7 7 Michigan oral fluid fentanyl tests, correct? Q. -- oral fluid tests? 8 I want to be careful when you're 8 A. We didn't report false positives

9 using the word false positive. 10 I'm using the phrase she used.

11 I understand that. 12 I'm using --

13 Α. And I'm trying --14 Okay. Q.

15 -- to explain science to you. Α.

16 My question is -- you've explained

17 that.

18 A. Okay. 19 My question is: Did anybody tell

20 Dr. Wagner about that there were false positives on

21 oral fluid fentanyl tests that you were doing for

22 Michigan?

23 A. They were not false positives, they

24 were more specimens that had a -- there's a larger

25 percentage in fentanyl, like I'd indicated

because we did an amino assay screen, we confirmed 9

10 the specimen, and then we reported out what the

11 results were.

12 Q. Whatever --

13 A. He -- he may have seen that more

specimens for fentanyl did not confirm than other 14

15 drugs.

16 Q. My -- my question to you is:

17 Whatever you think Dr. Glinn meant when she said

false positives, she says: It's something we can

19 say we are aware of and have looked into. Did --

20 did -- you don't know if anybody told Dr. Wagner. 21 You know that Dr. Wagner did not mention anything

22 about Michigan oral fluid fentanyl tests in his

23 report, correct?

24 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Asked

and answered.

Page 138 THE WITNESS: I'd have to re- -- I'd

> 2 have to reread his report.

3 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) I think it will

4 stand by itself.

5 Α. Okay.

> 6 When I asked you whether you were

standing by all of the tests that Averhealth has

done, you said you're not standing by all of them. 8

9 How many of them are you standing by?

10 A. I said that we report accurate test

11 results.

12 Q. I know, I know. You also said you

13 can't say you stand by all of them. How many do

you stand by? 14

15 A. Each individual report needs to be looked at from the analytical accuracy to report 16

17 those test results. I can't give you a number. I

18 do know of instances, which I'm sure you're going

to show me, where people have made human errors to 19

20 cause the result to be looked into for us to then

21 update the test result. Our procedures and our

22 processes that we use have us continually report

23 consistent, accurate results.

24 Q. How -- how many times have there been 25 human errors that have resulted in tests that you

previously, any lab would see this, that screened positive that do not confirm out. 2

3 Q. My --

A. I do not know if anybody told 4

5 Dr. Wagner.

6 And -- and you object to the phrase

false positive. That was not my phrase. That's -you understand that's Dr. Glinn's phrase. She said

9

"false positives," those were her words to you at

10 the time, correct?

11 A. Yes.

12

Did you respond to her and say, "What

13 are you talking about false positives? They're not

14 false positives"?

15 I'm putting --

16 No, my question is --Q.

17 Α. No.

18 -- did you respond --

19 No, I did not.

20 And that's because they were false

21 positives, weren't they?

22 They were screen positives.

23 They were --

A better -- a better word would have 24

been that they were amino assay screen positives,

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 36 of 111

Page | Dominique Delagnes

July 09, 2024

1 can't stand by?

2 A. It's not that we can't stand by the

3 test result, that we have to update the result,

4 right? We obviously can stand by what happened,

5 and the fact that the result's been updated.

- Q. Before it was reported?
- 7 A. After it was reported.
- 8 Q. Okay. How many -- how often has that
- 9 happened?

6

- 10 A. Rarely.
- 11 Q. I -- I understand what -- rarely,
- 12 what does that mean? What does -- how often has
- 13 that happened?
- 14 A. I'd have to go back and look at -- at
- 15 all of our corrected reports. I can -- I don't
- 16 know the number. Less than 1 percent. Probably
- 17 less than a half a percent of all specimens.
- 18 Q. How do you know that?
- 19 A. Because from my recollection of what
- 20 I know, I know very few instances. We -- we test
- 21 1.5 to 2 million tests per year, and -- and off the
- 22 top of my head, there's probably less than 50 that
- 23 I know that we've updated and re-resulted. So
- 24 that's a very, very small number.
- 25 Q. You updated them because after you

- Page 143

 1 Essington, and Matthew Mayor-Oliver [phonetic] were
- 2 part of putting all the data together.
- 3 Q. But have they -- have they gone back
- 4 to look at it and said these were done accurately?
 - A. Yes.

5

6

15

17

- Q. Where -- where is that? I have not
- 7 seen that documented anywhere?
- 8 A. It would be through the -- as they
- 9 pulled all the -- the litigation packets for you,
- 10 they re-reviewed all the data.
- 11 Q. And did they write that down or was
- 12 that just in their heads?
- 13 A. They reviewed the data through
- 14 pulling the information.
 - Q. I understand. Did they --
- 16 A. There's no written report.
 - Q. So there's no way for us to know how
- 18 they did that, there's no record other than them
- 19 saying, yeah, we looked at it and we think those
- 20 were done correctly?
- 21 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Assumes
- 22 facts not in evidence. There is a way, you can
- 23 take their depositions.
- 24 THE WITNESS: You will be deposing
- 25 Dr. Glinn and you will be deposing Christina

Page 142

- sent out the report, they were called to your
- 2 attention by whoever received the report, correct?
- 3 Is that what you just said?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. How about ones where nobody called it
- 6 to your attention and they just accepted your
- 7 results because they had no way of knowing any
- 8 different? Do you have any idea how many of those
- 9 were false positives?
- 10 A. No way of knowing.
- 11 Q. So when you say it's rare, less than
- 12 1 percent, that's just ones that were called to
- 13 your attention by somebody, and there could have
- 14 been a lot more that were not called to your
- 15 attention by anybody?
- 16 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Incomplete
- 17 hypothetical, assumes facts not in evidence, calls
- 18 for speculation.
- 19 But go ahead, if you know.
- 20 THE WITNESS: I don't know.
- 21 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Has anybody gone
- 22 back to look at the test results of my clients?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Who did that?
- 25 A. The -- Dr. Glinn, Christina

- Page 144

 1 Essington. So you can ask them about how they went
- 3 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) In -- in the false
- 4 positives that Dr. Glinn was talking about in her
- 5 hello ladies -- I call it the hello ladies memo
- 6 because that's how she started it -- did Averhealth
- 7 go back to the customers and say, "Hey, these
- 8 results were false positives"?

about and -- and did that.

- 9 A. We didn't report false positives in
- 10 these. Positive specimens were never reported to
- 11 the customer. That's what I was trying to explain
- 12 to you.
- 13 So in this case, it would have caused
- 14 an amino assay to screen positive, which would have
- 15 driven it onto the confirmation test. During the
- 16 confirmation test, we would have determined if
- 17 there's fentanyl in there or not in there. We did
- 18 not report these test results out until the
- 19 confirmation was done. So we never reported a
- 20 false positive in these instances, in these hello
- 21 lady memo.
- 22 Q. On the tests that came -- that
- 23 somebody complained about or called to your
- 24 attention --
- 25 A. Uh-huh.



Page Dominique Delagnes

July 09, 2024 Page 145 Page 147 Q. -- that you looked at and found that MR. CEJAS: She's answering the 1 2 those were inaccurate and those were false 2 question. She needs to have an opportunity -positives, what did you do with that information? 3 MR. CORNFELD: We --Did you retract the report? 4 4 MR. CEJAS: -- to answer. 5 We did. 5 Α. MR. CORNFELD: It's --6 Okay. And -- and what caused the 6 MR. CEJAS: I will stop this false positives in those cases? deposition if you're going to keep cutting her off, 8 A. In the one that I'm talking about, and we can show this to the judge. I understand which I -- I know is well-documented in here, was 9 you're tying her -a -- 13 specimens that we know that there was a 10 MR. CORNFELD: I --10 tray that the individual made a mistake and 11 MR. CEJAS: -- to a yes-or-no misloaded that tray. And so we reported out that 12 auestion. 13 batch of specimens. 13 MR. CORNFELD: Hey, let me --14 A caseworker in Michigan came back to 14 MR. CEJAS: -- that was not one. 15 us and indicated, "Hey, can you look into this test 15 MR. CORNFELD: Can I respond? Can I 16 result?" Based on that request by a Michigan 16 respond --17 caseworker, we went back, we looked at that 17 MR. CEJAS: No, she can answer --18 particular specimen, and we learned that there was MR. CORNFELD: No, I'm --18 19 an error in loading that tray. And in doing so, we 19 MR. CEJAS: -- and then you're going 20 not only updated that test result, but we reran all 20 to talk. 21 the specimens and also corrected another 12 21 MR. CORNFELD: No, I'm going to -- if 22 specimens that were in that batch. We sent a 22 you're going to -- if you're going to make a long 23 letter to each up with of the caseworkers --23 speaking objection, I am going to respond to you, a 24 Q. Hey, can I -- can I --24 long, improper speaking objection. She explained 25 MR. CEJAS: Let her -- let her -the situation, I don't need her to go on for -- for Page 146 Page 148 minutes about it. We are all familiar with it. 1 MR. CORNFELD: Hey -- hey --2 MR. CEJAS: No, Rick -- Rick, she's 2 MR. CEJAS: You asked an open-ended 3 3 question -answering --4 MR. CORNFELD: We are all well 4 MR. CORNFELD: Excuse me --5 5 familiar with it --MR. CEJAS: No, Rick --6 MR. CORNFELD: Excuse me --6 MR. CEJAS: -- she's allowed to 7 7 MR. CEJAS: Rick -answer it. 8 8 MR. CORNFELD: I -- if you want her MR. CORNFELD: Excuse me. 9 to testify at trial at length, I don't think that MR. CEJAS: Rick, you have to let her 9 has anything to do with this lawsuit. But you --10 10 finish answering. 11 MR. CORNFELD: Excuse me. 11 you can -- you're, you know, welcome to try. 12 12 (BY MR. CORNFELD) My question is: MR. CEJAS: That was not a yes-or-no 13 question. Other than that, Doctor -- excuse me, Ms. Delagnes 14 (BY MR. CORNFELD) Excuse me. I --14 -- and we're -- you know, we're all familiar with Q. 15 that's well-documented. I -- I am familiar with that; it was documented; you testified about it, 16 those 13 cases. and we've seen documents about it -- how else did 16 17 Α. Okay. 17 you discover that there were false positives? 18 It would take me some research. We 18 You don't need to go into it. 19 MR. CEJAS: Please finish your 19 obviously maintain a file of anytime that -- that 20 20 we look into an individual result, if there's a answer. 21 21 question to it, and we do what's considered an MR. CORNFELD: No. You don't --22 MR. CEJAS: No, are you -- you can't investigation. I don't know all the top of them 22 23 keep stopping her. It's one thing if it's a 23 off the top of my head in the 10 years that I've 24 yes-or-no question, which that was not. 24 been with the organization. 25 25 Okay. You said you maintain files



MR. CORNFELD: It --

888-893-3767

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 38 of 111

Page Dominique Delagnes

July 09, 2024 Page 149 Page 151 for them? 1 Α. Yes. 2 A. We have something that -- there's 2 And you know that Dr. Wagner was 3 information when we are going through an 3 not -- does not mention anything about the CAP inspection, any type of corrective action. So yes, probation or the CAP investigation in his report, we'd have to go back to the corrective action 5 correct? aspect of it. 6 Α. Correct. 6 7 Q. Okay. I would request those files. 7 And that's because no one from 8 Okav. 8 Averhealth told him about it, correct? And -- and if -- if my request is for 9 9 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Overbroad, the corrective action files, you understand what 10 10 calls for speculation. I'm referring to? 11 11 But if you know, go ahead. 12 A. Yes, I do. 12 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure. 13 MR. CEJAS: Please send us an a RFP 13 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You're not sure if and we'll -- we'll respond it. anybody told Dr. Wagner about it? 14 14 15 MR. CORNFELD: I'm sorry? 15 A. Correct. 16 MR. CEJAS: Please send us an RFP and 16 Q. Who would have told him? One of us may have when he was on 17 we'll respond to it. 17 Α. 18 MR. CORNFELD: I'm telling you now I 18 site. I don't recall. 19 think that's -- you know, that's something that 19 Q. Were you there when he was on site? should have been produced, but --20 20 Α. I was. 21 MR. CEJAS: Send us an RFP, Rick. 21 Q. Do you recall telling him that? 22 22 MR. CORNFELD: I'm making -- I'm Α. I don't recall. making the request now for the corrective action Do you know that when he was on site, 23 23 24 files. 24 he didn't even know about Dr. Riley? 25 MR. CEJAS: And I would appreciate an 25 I did not know --Page 150 Page 152 RFP, as the rules require. MR. CEJAS: Objection. Calls for 1 1 2 (BY MR. CORNFELD) And -- and what 2 speculation. 3 3 THE WITNESS: I don't know that caused the other false positives? 4 that's accurate. I don't know. 4 Again, I'd have to look through the 5 files. 5 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Take a look at 6 Okay. Will the corrective action 6 page 7 of Exhibit 57 Dr. Wagner's report. files tell us what caused the --7 7 Uh-huh. Yes. 8 Α. Yes. 8 Do you see it says: Concerns raised Q. 9 Q. 9 by the judiciary? Okay. 10 Α. 10 MR. CORNFELD: I think you're going Yes. 11 to get it within minutes. 11 And he says: Subsequent to the visit 12 MR. CEJAS: That's fine. in the week of February 22nd, 2021, the team was 12 13 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Do you see on -made aware of allegations made by a former 13 14 strike that. laboratory director through communication with 15 Handing you what's been marked as 15 judges and in her testimony at trial. Exhibit 57 to this deposition. Do you see that 16 Do you see that? 16 17 this is Dr. Wagner's report, it's dated 17 February 28th, 2021 --18 18

So nobody, when -- when he was there 19 in the laboratory, which was in January, correct?

20 Α. Yes.

25

21 Nobody told him about Dr. Riley and Q. 22 what she was saying?

23 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Calls for speculation, overbroad, and asked and answered. 24

Go ahead.

correct?

A. Yes.

Michigan DHHS.

Yes.

Α.

Q.

Q. -- and it's entitled Averhealth Lab

You're familiar with this document,

Site Visit Report prepared for the State of

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 39 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 153 Page 155 THE WITNESS: He was hired by the And to provide him a list of 1 2 State of Michigan to come in and do an on-site 2 specimens. test -- like an on-site inspection with a very 3 Q. targeted, looking at our test results. And I don't when he was on site, correct? know what he was told by the State of Michigan --5 A. As I'd indicated, he was hired by Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Well, he --6 6 MDHHS --7 A. -- about the -- the -- about his 7 Q. I -- I understand that. visit. 8 8 Α. -- to come on site to do an 9 Well, you know that he was -- he 9 investigation --10 was -- he was -- wasn't told until a month after 10 Q. You provided him -his visit, and that was through communications with 11

12

15

16

17

1

3

12 judges, correct? 13 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Calls 14 for speculation, assumes facts not in evidence. 15 But go ahead, if you know.

16 THE WITNESS: I don't know what -- he was hired by the State of Michigan to come on site. 17

I do not know what Michigan had let him know before 18 19 he came on site.

20 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) What you know is

what he said is -- in his report, and that he 22 didn't learn until a month after he was in the

23 laboratory, correct?

24 MR. CEJAS: Same objections. Calls

25 for speculation.

21

1

Page 154 If you know, go ahead.

2 THE WITNESS: That's what he wrote in 3 this report.

4 (BY MR. CORNFELD) And you have no 5 reason to think that's untrue, do you?

6 A. I do not.

7 Did you -- did you and your -- and

8 the other Averhealth personnel talk to Dr. Wagner

9 and explain what your procedures were when he was

10 on site?

11 A. Yes.

12 And -- and you know that Mr. Herzog

13 sent him a -- a letter before the site visit.

14 correct?

15 A. Is that the e-mail that you showed me 16 previously that I said I'd not seen? No, that was

17 something else. I do not know what he sent.

Q. Okay. Well, we'll cover that with 18

19 Mr. Herzog.

20 A. Okay.

21 Just assume that -- that he -- that

he communicated. But your -- your laboratory was 22

23 in communication with him, correct?

24 To schedule this, yes.

25 And -- and while you were -- And -- and to provide him information

11 -- for us, yes.

-- you provided him information while

he was on site, didn't you? 13

Yes. Yes. 14 Α.

> And nobody told him about Dr. Riley Q. and what her allegations were so that he could evaluate those when he was at the laboratory?

18 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Asked and

19 answered.

20 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Is that -- that's 21 correct?

22 Α. Yes.

23 And do you see that he says in the Q. next sentence: Specifically, the former laboratory 24

25 director.

And that's Dr. Riley, correct?

2 Α. Correct.

Stated that the number of quality

control specimens being run is insufficient and

does not meet the 10 percent threshold required of

6 CAP-accredited laboratories.

7 Do you see that?

8 Yes. Α.

9 Nobody -- nobody told him about the

four allegations he made to CAP, at least he

11 doesn't say anything about it in his report,

12 correct?

15

13 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Overbroad,

14 calls for speculation.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Correct. He does not 16

17 bring it up in the report. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Dr. Wagner has --18

19 besides the concerns raised by the judiciary, he

20 has a section called Areas of Concern that is on

21 page 6.

22 Okay.

23 And he divides those into concerns

24 related to amino assay and related to liquid

25 chromatography, mass spectrometry, correct?



Page 156

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 40 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 157 Page 159

A. Yes. 1 Q. I have a lot of questions I would

like to ask somebody knowledgeable about what that

-- Dr. Wagner says here. Would it be the case that

that person should be Dr. Glinn? 5

6 A. I can talk about the MultiQuant

software and what it flags and how parameters are

set. If you want to go into more details, you can

talk to Dr. Glinn. 9

2

10 Q. Because you would not be sufficiently

knowledgeable? 11

12 A. She's going to be able to explain it

13 better, yes.

14

Q. Is that also correct regarding what

he's -- and what he's talking about with regard to 15

16 MultiQuant that you just mentioned, that's what he

17 says in the first paragraph in the section on

LC-MS/MS on page 6 of his report? 18

19 A. Yes, I can speak to it a little bit.

She'll be able to speak it to it more thoroughly. 20

21 Q. All right. I mean, I don't want to

22 deprive you of the opportunity.

23 A. That's okay. You can have her

24 address it. She can go into it in more detail.

25 Okay. And then -- and do it better

MR. CEJAS: So we had a discussion 1

off the record and kind of as we were alluding to

before we went off, so the -- the specifics of the

granular aspects of the testing process as outlined

in Section 3 on page 6, which is Bates-stamped

616225, Michele is going to be the one who gets

into the specifics, the granular.

8 But Dominique would talk to the big

9 picture, which is the fact that this happened, and

10 then the findings, and number 5 on the conclusions

page would be something that she would come in and 11

talk about at trial. So you can do with that what 12

13 you want.

14 MR. CORNFELD: And would the same be

true for Section 4? I mean, you -- off the record. 15

16 you told us that the only thing Ms. Delagnes

17 would -- might testify about at trial regarding the

18 Wagner report is what's set forth in Section 5.

20 quick.

19

THE WITNESS: And 4. Because 4 21

22 already talked about, which I already spoke about,

MR. CEJAS: Let me look at 4 real

23 which is the 13 --

24 MR. CEJAS: Right.

25 THE WITNESS: -- specimens.

talked about the 13, so she's --

Page 160

than you can? 1

2 Just into more detail. She's a

3 toxicologist and she uses it day in and day out,

MultiQuant. 4

5 Q. Yeah. And -- and would you -- would

you rely on Dr. Glinn, if you had a question about

7 what Dr. Wagner meant in his section on areas of

8 concern?

6

9 A. I don't understand the question.

10 Q. If -- if you had a question about

11 what Dr. Wagner was saying in his section of his

12 report entitled Areas of Concern --

13 Α. Okay.

14 Q. -- would you rely on Dr. Glinn for

15 that?

16 It -- it's going to depend on what

17 specifically it is in here.

18 MR. PLEBAN: Can we go off the record

19 real quick?

20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Time is 1:23 p.m.

21 We are off the record.

22 (A discussion was held off the

23 record.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 1:31. 24

25 We are back on the record.

MR. CEJAS: So I -- I think she has 1

THE WITNESS: I've talked about the

4 4.

2

3

Page 158

5 MR. CORNFELD: But other than that,

6 the only thing she will testify, or may testify

about at trial, talking about Ms. Delagnes, would 7

be Section 5? 8

9 MR. CEJAS: Let me look at the rest of this. Well, I mean, there's also a section here

that says the testimony Dominique Delagnes will

12 provide to the inspection is found to be accurate.

13 THE WITNESS: So that's why I said 4 14 and 5.

15 MR. CEJAS: Yeah. So I mean, I think if there's something you want to ask about 4, ask 16

17 about 4. But the granular parts of the testing,

18 like I said, she's not going to get into. But if

19 there's something in 4, I think she's already

20 talked about those things, right?

21 MR. CORNFELD: Yeah. I mean, I --22 and I don't want to -- you know, if somehow

23 Dr. Glinn becomes unavailable, I don't want to

24 preclude you. I mean, that stipulation would not

be in effect anymore. It's dependent on Dr. Glinn



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 41 of 111 July 09, 2024 Pagel Dominique Delagnes Page 161 Page 163 that were lower than other customers, and there was being available. 2 2 But in -- in terms of the basis of a point in time where we had an issue in our 3 database, but we've then since corrected it. Dr. Wagner's conclusions in -- in Section 5, as he 4 set forth -- set it forth in his report, my 4 Q. Is it -- that's after you changed the 5 cutoffs? 5 understanding is you're saying that the witness on 6 that at trial will be Dr. Glinn? THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I think your mic 6 7 MR. CEJAS: Correct. And maybe pop off, sir. 8 Dr. Wagner, whomever else. 8 THE WITNESS: Ew. 9 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: You're okay, 9 MR. CORNFELD: As far as --10 MR. CEJAS: But it will be 10 ma'am. toxicologists. 11 THE WITNESS: I'm okay now? 11 12 12 MR. CEJAS: Rick's not there. MR. CORNFELD: Speaking on behalf of 13 Averhealth as the company, as far as an Averhealth 13 MR. CORNFELD: Oh. 14 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Was this something 14 employee. 15 MR. CEJAS: Correct. Or to the 15 that happened after you clanged the cutoffs? 16 extent that someone like Christine or Shannon or 16 A. I don't want to misspeak. I have to 17 someone who was individually, but it's going to be 17 look into it further. someone who does that on a day-to-day basis. 18 You're not familiar as you sit here? 18 19 MR. CORNFELD: Okay. And you know, I 19 I'm not familiar as we sit here, no. 20 Is there any circumstance in which 20 don't know, maybe you're going to want an expert Averhealth would consider it appropriate to 21 witness to talk about it. 21 22 22 backdate a document? MR. CEJAS: Exactly. 23 23 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Overbroad. MR. CORNFELD: We can't preclude you 24 from that, but it's not going to be Ms. Delagnes, 24 Go ahead, you can answer the 25 correct? 25 question. Page 162 Page 164 1 MR. CEJAS: She's not going to get 1 THE WITNESS: Can you be more into expert testimony from a toxicologist, specific? 2 3 obviously, right. 3 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) No. Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Regarding 4 4 A. Okay. Section 4, what's set forth in the Wagner report in 5 I would like to know if there's any Section 4, there's the reference to the 13 false circumstance in which Averhealth would consider it 6 7 positives. You've told us about that, correct? appropriate to backdate a document. 7 8 A. Yes. 8 MR. CEJAS: Same objection. It's 9 Q. All right. There is a reference to 9 vaque, overbroad. 10 -- to your testimony in Michigan, and we've talked THE WITNESS: I don't know. 10 11 about your testimony, correct? 11 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You can't think of 12 A. Yes. 12 one? 13 And then he refers to an allegation 13 A. I didn't say I can't think of one. I 14 that a false positive was reported, as a retest of 14 mean, off the top of my head, I don't know. I 15

the specimen was reported as negative. 15

16 Do you see that?

17 Α. Yes.

18 Do you know what he's referring to

19 there?

20 I do not. Α.

21 Q. You don't know?

22 No. I take that back. I am pretty

23 sure that is the -- I have to find the right

document. That was where in the database, we had

specific cutoffs for Michigan based on the contract

don't know.

18

16 Are you aware of anytime when

17 Averhealth has backdated a document?

Not that I can recall.

19 Did Averhealth hire Dr. Eugene

20 Schwilke to conduct an inspection of its lab?

21 A. No, he was an employee of ours and he

22 did it -- as an Averhealth employee, he performed

23 on off-cycle years of a CAP inspection, you're

supposed to do an -- a self-inspection. So what we 24

asked him to do was conduct Averhealth's



Page: 42 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 165 self-inspection. what you were expecting CAP to do when they came in 2 Q. I -- I've seen documents referred to to do the nonroutine inspection while you were on 3 a CAP interim inspection that Dr. Schwilke did --3 probation, correct? 4 A. Correct. 4 A. It's an internal self-inspection. 5 Q. -- in -- in the spring of -- or -- or 5 I mean, but he would be doing the the first half of 2021 while you were under 6 6 same kind of inspection that CAP would do, was 7 probation. 7 planning to do during your probation; is that 8 A. That was part of our -- as I 8 right? 9 indicated, that was part of our -- our own -- he Α. Yes. was -- he was acting on behalf of Averhealth as an 10 Q. And when was Dr. Schwilke an employee of Averhealth? employee. So she provided extra witness testimony 11 11 12 for us on a regular basis. And part of our 12 A. I don't know the exact dates off the certification requirements on off-years when CAP 13 top of my head. I can follow up. doesn't do their regular inspections, we are to 14 Yeah, approximately when did he -perform a self-inspection, and Dr. Schwilke 15 did he become an employee? performed that self-inspection for us. 16 A. Well, all my dates run together. I'm 17 not trying to be vague, I honestly don't recall.

16 17 Q. Did he perform any other

self-inspections besides the one in 2021? 18 19 A. Not that I recall. 20 Q. Okay. So that -- that inspection

that Dr. Schwilke did in 2021, that did not have to 21 do with preparing for the -- the nonroutine 22

23 inspection that CAP was planning to do that year?

24 A. It was part of our regulatory

requirement, as I indicated. So one of CAP's 25

Is he still an employee?

A. He took a full-time job with a

to assist with litigation anymore. I believe it

When did he stop being an employee?

laboratory in Louisiana, so he didn't have the time

was a year-and-a-half ago, but again, I don't know,

let me check on -- I can -- you know, we can call

He is not.

routine inspection. On off-years of that 2 Okay. If you could provide that Q. inspection, you do a self-inspection, and

Page 166

18

19

20

21

22

23

4 Dr. Schwilke as -- as an employee of Averhealth

conducted our self-inspection for us.

requirements is every other year, they perform a

All right. So -- and was that an 6 inspection that would be similar to a CAP

8 inspection?

2

3

9 A. It's a requirement within the CAP certification. So yes, they tell you to take the 10

checklist. So every -- every off-year, so we were

12 initially inspected by CAP in 2016, we did

13 self-inspection in 2017, they do an inspection in

14 2018, we did a self-inspection in 2019, they did an

15 inspection in 2020, a routine inspection. And in

2021, we were to do a self-inspection, and

17 Dr. Schwilke conducted that self-inspection for us in 2021. 18

19 Q. He did it in March -- on March 8th

20 and 9th of 2021?

21 Α. I don't recall.

22 Q. We'll -- we'll take a look at it in a

23 minute.

24 Α. Okay.

25 So it would be something similar to up with his exact dates of employment.

3 information --

A. Uh-huh.

5 Q. -- to Mr. Cejas and so he can provide

it to us. Would you do that? 6

7 A. Yes.

Q. And how often did he testify for

9 Averhealth?

10 On a regular basis. I mean, he -- I 11 would say several times a month. I have a record

of every testimony he's ever done for us.

13 Q. I would request that.

Α. Okay.

And do you have his transcripts, the

transcripts of his testimony? 16

17 A. We don't. It's -- he was acting on -- just like Dr. Glinn is, he provided testimony in 18

19 cases.

14

15

Did he ever -- did Dr. Schwilke ever 20 Q. 21 provide testimony in a case in which there was a 22 comparable expert on the opposing side?

23 I don't know.

24 Has Averhealth ever provided expert

25 testimony in a case in which there was a comparable



Page 168

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 43 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 169 Page 171 expert on the opposing side? in a civil case that was not a domestic case over 2 Α. Yes. something an individual -- where the Court was 3 Q. When was that? deciding in an individual's child custody? 3 4 A. We get -- we are subpoenaed to 4 A. Excuse me for not understanding law, testify on our test results regularly. but I don't know the difference of what you're 5 5 6 Q. I understand that. 6 asking. 7 Α. So I can't give you every date. I 7 MR. CEJAS: Are you asking a case 8 don't know. 8 where Averhealth's a defendant? Is that what 9 you're trying to ask? All right. Has Averhealth ever 10 testified -- or excuse me, provided expert 10 MR. CORNFELD: Well, that would be testimony in a case in which there was an expert on 11 11 one thing, yeah. 12 the other side and the other side obtained anything 12 MR. PLEBAN: And in civil cases. like the volume of documents we have provided [sic] they're nondomestic, right? So you have all the in this case? domestic cases where you're going to have the child 14 15 Α. No. 15 custody issue. I bet there's going to be a ton of 16 Those cases are limited to the 16 those. You'll have criminal ones. And then are 17 records regarding an individual test? 17 there -- and another civil one, right? So nondomestic civil. 18 A. Yes. 18 19 And when -- when Averhealth has gone 19 MR. CEJAS: What would that be other up against an expert on the other side, has 20 than --20 21 Averhealth ever lost? 21 THE WITNESS: Well, it would be a 22 22 I don't know the answer to that. nondomestic civil --23 23 MR. CEJAS: -- a case against Q. Okay. And would that be in your 24 24 records? Averhealth? 25 25 I'm not sure. I -- I -- I honestly MR. PLEBAN: I think it would Page 170 Page 172 don't know. I'm not trying to be evasive. probably -- I think it would only probably be if 2 Q. Okav. you've been sued before, probably, unless you're 3 A. As I indicated, we get litigation 3 acting as an expert in a case for another person's requests daily and we provide expert testimony on a drug testing where Schwilke's talking about --5 regular basis. 5 MR. CEJAS: So maybe ask it that way. 6 6 Q. Has -- has Averhealth ever provided I think she'll understand that. expert testimony in a lawsuit in which -- like 7 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Has -- has this, that's not a -- say a domestic civil case Averhealth ever provided -- has Averhealth ever where the issue is a -- one particular laboratory provided expert testimony in a case in which test, but where the issue is Averhealth's overall 10 Averhealth was the defendant? 10 11 testing practices? 11 Α. I don't believe so. 12 A. I mean, every time we testify, we 12 Averhealth has been sued before, 13 testify to our testing practices. 13 correct? 14 Q. Right. But what I mean is, I mean, 14 Α. Averhealth has been sued before, yes. vou said earlier that the -- the cases are usually 15 15 Okay. But it never proceeded to the

16 limited to one -- to one test.

17 Not one test, one defendant.

18 Okay. But they're limited to that

individual's tests, correct? 19

20 A. Correct.

21 And so maybe that answered the Q.

22 question --

23 A. Okay.

24 -- that I was just asking, but has

Averhealth ever provided expert testimony in a --

point where you were designating expert testimony? 16

17 Correct.

18

Has Averhealth ever gone to trial

when it's been sued before? 19

20 Not since I've been with the 21 organization that I know of, no.

22 And that goes back to 2014?

23 Correct.

24 Yeah, what -- what -- are you

25 familiar with the Mack case. Mack versus



Page: 44 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 173 Page 175 Averhealth? 1 inspection report. 2 2 MR. CEJAS: That's the one in Do you see that? 3 3 Yes. Philadelphia, right? 4 THE WITNESS: Yes. 4 Q. And then attached to that, is that --5 is interim inspection report dated March 8, 2021, (BY MR. CORNFELD) Are you familiar 5 and March 9. 2021? 6 with that? 7 7 Α. Yes. Α. Yes. 8 Is that pending? 8 Q. I'm handing you what's been marked as No, it's been settled. Or it's Exhibit 59, which is a document headed: Averhealth 9 9 10 Lab Director Weekly QC Review, Dates Covered 3/7/21 been --11 to 3/13/21, with Bates number on the first page of THE WITNESS: Thank you. What is the 12 2651. 12 right... 13 MR. CEJAS: I can tell you. It was 13 Do you have that? disposed of on summary judgment --14 Α. Yes. 14 15 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 15 Let's talk about the lab director 16 MR. CEJAS: -- in Averhealth's favor. 16 weekly QC review. 17 MR. PLEBAN: Okay. 17 A. Okay. 18 Do you see that under the notes --18 MR. CEJAS: And upheld on appeal. Q. 19 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Nick. 19 well, strike that, 20 This was prepared by Dr. Glinn, 20 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) And I -- I assume correct? 21 for that it was -- it was disposed of --21 22 22 What was prepared by Dr. Glinn? MR. CEJAS: Two different summaries, 23 23 a little bit. The lab director weekly QC review, 24 Exhibit 59. 24 (BY MR. CORNFELD) It was disposed on 25 25 summary --Yes. Page 174 Page 176 1 A. Yeah, what I said was inaccurate. Are you familiar with it? 1 Thank you for the correction. A. 2 2 I've seen it, yes. 3 Q. Okay. And I -- and I take it from 3 All right. Are you -- under notes, 4 what you've told us that the Mack case was disposed she refers to the interim CAP 2021 inspection by 5 on summary judgment on some basis other than Dr. Schwilke, and she lists what she says are something that would have been supported by expert 6 summation conference items. 7 7 testimony, correct? Do you see that? 8 MR. CEJAS: I'll object to the extent 8 A. Summation conference items? Oh, yes, 9 it calls for a legal conclusion. 9 I see. 10 But if you know, go ahead. 10 Are you that familiar with those Q. 11 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 11 items? 12 MR. CEJAS: You can find the order. 12 I would not have reviewed the CAP 13 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You -- you just 13 inspection. It would be something -- I mean, I'm 14 know -- you just know that you didn't have expert 14 not sure. testimony in that case, correct? 15 15 Q. Did you -- did you receive this at or 16 A. Correct. near the time it was prepared? 16 17 Q. Okay. Did the other side have expert 17 Did I receive this, this document

18 testimony?

19 Α. I don't know.

20 You've been handed what's been marked

21 as Exhibit 58, which is a document that has the

22 Bates number 32404 on the first page, and the first

23 page contains an e-mail from Eugene Schwilke dated

March 24, 2021, and that was to Dr. Glinn and with

a copy to yourself with the subject interim

Q. And did you review that? At the time, probably. I probably

And did you -- did you receive

Dr. Schwilke's interim inspection that's --

-- part of 32404?

itself? I don't believe so.

Yes.

Yes.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α.

Q.

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 45 of 111

Page Dominiques Delagnes

July 09, 2024 Page 177 Page 179 looked at it. 1 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 2 2 Q. When you say you looked at it, did Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Well, you know you review it and see what his findings were and 3 when -- when he said in his e-mail that he was what his recommendations were? going to follow up with -- with additional items. 5 Yes. 5 he couldn't have meant what was in the lab director 6 Q. All right. If you look at Exhibit weekly QC review that had already been prepared and 6 59, what's listed under Summation Conference Items, signed, correct? would I be correct that these were items that 8 MR. CEJAS: I'm going to object to Dr. Schwilke brought to Averhealth in his meeting the extent it calls for speculation. 9 10 following his inspection? 10 But if you know --MR. CORNFELD: It's not speculation. 11 A. Yes. 11 12 Q. Did -- and did that in person while 12 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go --13 he was on site? 13 A. I don't know even -- I don't 14 A. I'm not sure if he did it while he 14 understand what you're asking me right now. Like, 15 was on site or if he provided it after the fact. what are we looking at, what are you trying to get 16 Because it talks about he was on site, and then he 16 to? What's your question? 17 says he'll follow up with some items. 17 You said that he was -- he was going 18 Q. I'm -- I'm sorry, where -- where are to send the additional information in his e-mail. 18 19 you looking? 19 I read what his e-mail said here, A. If you look at his e-mail, it says: 20 20 yes. Here are the other reports. Also attached is my 21 Okay. But that was talking about 21 22 CV, diploma, ABFT certificate. See my comments something other than what is in the lab director 22 23 23 regarding clinical consultant in the checklist. weekly QC review dated March 13, 2021, correct? Info on COLA competency. Also, these are 24 MR. CEJAS: Same objection. considered draft versions, so if you have comments 25 But if you know, go ahead. Page 178 Page 180 or suggestions, please let me know. 1 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 1 2 Q. Okay. But that e-mail was March 24? 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) It had to be 3 Yes. 3 because he already -- that was already in writing. Α. And the lab director weekly QC 4 Okay. Where is this associated with 4 Q. review, if you look at the back page that's dated this? That's -- that's what I'm trying to put together. Is this in this one? 6 March 13. about a week-and-a-half earlier. 6 7 7 Α. 3/7 to 3/21. Q. No. 8 Well, look at the back page when 8 Like what -- where is this document Q. 9 Dr. Glinn signed it. from versus this? 9 10 10 Α. Okay. 3/13. Okay. You're holding up --11 Yes. 11 I'm holding up --12 So she's reviewing QCs from the week -- the lab director --12 13 of 3/7 to 3/13. 13 -- number 58 --14 Q. I --14 Q. Excuse me. let me -- let me -- let 15 So she reviewed them on 3/13. 15 me --I understand. But that would --16 Q. -- and 59 --16 Α. 17 Α. Yeah. 17 Q. -- ask my question. -- would that suggest that these were 18 18 Α. Okay. 19 items that Dr. Schwilke brought to her attention 19 You were comparing the lab director 20 when he was on site, or at least they were not the 20 weekly QC review and the formal report that 21 ones that he said he was going to follow up with in 21 Dr. Schwilke prepared that's part of Exhibit 58. 22 his e-mail later that month? 22 Okay. 23 MR. CEJAS: I'm going to object to 23 And okay. They both relate to his 24 the extent it calls for speculation. 24 interim CAP 2020 inspection, correct? If you look



at the notes on the lab director weekly QC

25

But if you know, go ahead.

25

Page Dominigue Delagnes

July 09, 2024

Page 181 Page 183 1 So in number 2, then if you review --2 cross-reference against the pages 3 through 11, A. Okay. 3 you'll see where he suggested making updates to -- it refers to his interim CAP 2021 4 inspection, correct? SOPs. So that's what he's referring to. 5 5 Q. And number 3 when he says -- in Α. Yes. 6 Exhibit 59 -- strike that. 6 Q. And then it says: Summation 7 Were you part of the conference where conference items. 8 A. Okay. Yes, it does. he presented his items that are reflected in Exhibit 59? 9 Q. And so -- okay. So that would mean this was something that he presented, these were 10 A. I was not on site. I don't recall if 10 items he presented in a conference? I sat in on the conference call remotely. I know I 11 12 was not on site. I don't recall if I was part of A. In a conference? You mean in a 13 meeting? 13 the meeting or not. 14 Q. Do you remember -- if you were part 14 Q. It sounds like it. It savs summation conference. of the meeting, do you remember any -- I take it 15 15 16 Okay. Summation conference, okay, 16 you don't remember anything about it? 17 17 A. I remember that it happened. I yes. remember that it was completed. 18 All right. Whereas his report was 18 19 something he submitted later, Exhibit 58? 19 But my question is: If you don't 20 remember if you were there, I assume you don't 20 A. Okay. 21 Q. All right. I didn't think that 21 remember who said what. should be hard. 22 22 A. I mean, it's documented here on -- on 23 23 things that he indicated, right? He clearly wrote MR. CEJAS: I move to strike that 24 24 comment. recommendations on here. 25 MR. CORNFELD: That's okay. It was 25 In -- in his formal report? Page 182 Page 184 just an extraneous comment. Yes. 1 Α. 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) On Exhibit 59, 2 Okay. In his -- in -- on Exhibit 59, 3 item 2 of his summation conference items. he says: 3 in the lab director weekly QC report, number 3 is: Additional details needed in certain SOPs. Additional details for root cause analysis. 4 5 A. Yes. 5 Do you know what additional details 6 Do you know what those were? Q. 6 he was suggesting? 7 A. I believe it's probably outlined in 7 Can I -- can I -- can I just 8 here, but I don't remember off the top of my head. 8 interrupt this for a moment? 9 Okay. I don't believe it is. 9 Sure. 10 A. Okay. 10 MR. CORNFELD: And let's -- let's go 11 Okay. So is that something we would 11 off the record. have to ask Dr. Glinn about? 12 12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Time is 2:03 p.m. 13 Let me see if it's in here. I 13 We are off the record. believe that on page AH0032424, under the 14 14 (A discussion was held off the Aliquoting, there's a recommendation about updating 15 15 record.) 16 the accessioning SOP. 16 (A short break was taken.) 17 Q. You -- you think that when it says 17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 2:17. additional details needed in certain SOPs and We are back on the record. 18 19 that's plural --19 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Ms. Delagnes, 20 A. Okay. So we'd need to go through 20 Exhibit 58 --21 21 each of these from page -- where he had indicated Α. Yes. 22 was the information available and acceptable, yes 22 -- the -- the CAP interim inspection 23 or no, and then his comments. So if we looked at 23 of Averhealth that Dr. Schwilke did that begins on his comments, he talks about where he suggests -page 32406. Before I showed it to you, when was 24

25

the last time you saw it?

recommends that we update SOPs.

888-893-3767

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 47 of 111 Page Dominigues Delagnes July 09, 2024 Page 185 Page 187 Do you know if anyone else was? 1 1 A. I don't recall. 2 2 You didn't see it in preparing for Α. I don't recall. It probably -- there 3 the 30(b)(6) deposition, did you? 3 very well could have been other laboratory 4 A. I reviewed it broadly. It was on the 4 employees. 5 5 list. I -- I believe that I went through it and But you don't know that, you just 6 know that Dr. Glinn was present, correct? looked at what the findings were. 7 7 Α. Correct. Q. All of -- all of the findings, 8 whether positive or negative, good or bad or 8 All right. And the -- the report that Dr. Schwilke prepared beginning on page 32406, 9 neutral, those are all contained in the report, 9 10 that was something that he directed to Dr. Glinn, correct? 11 A. What I looked at was what's contained correct? 11 12 A. Yes. 12 in the report. 13 Q. Do you have any knowledge beyond 13 And -- and so you would expect that what's contained in the report? 14 Dr. Glinn would be knowledgeable about it --14 15 Α. No. 15 A. Yes. 16 Do you have any knowledge of what 16 -- correct? More knowledgeable than 17 Averhealth did to implement any of the 17 you as you sit here today? 18 recommendations? Depends upon the item, but yes. 18 19 A. I do. I mean, obviously one of them 19 I mean, she'd be knowledgeable about I did myself, right. So on here, it talks about 20 the whole thing, maybe you have some knowledge here 20 or there --21 that it says formalized chain of custody policy, 21 22 A. Yes, that is correct, yes.

22 and it was done by me on 3/13/21.

Q. Okay. Dr. Glinn was present in the

summation conference that's referred to in

That -- you're referring to

23 Q. -- but in total, on the Schwilke 23 24 24 report, would Dr. Glinn be the most knowledgeable Exhibit 59? 25 Α. Yes, I am. person at Averhealth about that? Page 186 1 Q. Item 8; is that right? A. Yes. 1 2 Α. Yes. 2 Q. And more knowledgeable -- much more 3 Was that an SOP? 3 knowledgeable than you, correct? Ω 4 Yes. 4 A. Don't love the term "much." I mean, Α. 5 And the chain of custody SOP? 5 she would be more knowledgeable. Q. 6 6 MR. CORNFELD: All right. But based Q. That you did on March 13 of 2021? on that, I'm not going to ask any more questions, 7 7 8 Α. Yes. but I would expect that if Ms. Delagnes, if you are 9 So that was pretty timely because 9 going to have her testify at trial, you don't have that was the same day that Dr. Glinn wrote the 10 to tell us until shortly before trial, obviously, 11 report in Exhibit 59, correct? but we'll be exchanging witness lists, and if she's 12 Dr. Glinn or Dr. -going to testify about that, you will let us know 13 I mean Dr. -- yes, Dr. Glinn wrote and we reserve the right to request a supplemental 14 her lab director weekly QC review on March 13 that 14 deposition, which I believe the Court would give 15 contains the statement that you would formalize the us. And I believe since you're a reasonable 16 chain of custody policy. person, Nick, that you would agree to it at that 17 Α. That's what it says, yes. 17 time, but I'm not going to ask you to agree to it 18 Did -- had you done that as of March 18 to today. 19 13? 19 MR. CEJAS: We will be following the 20 I don't recall. I mean, that's what 20 Α. federal rules, and we can --21 21 this says. MR. CORNFELD: And reasonable

procedures which allow for parties to agree to

MR. CEJAS: Obviously, there are

rules with respect to expert disclosures. We'll be

things like supplemental depositions.

Page 188

22

23

24

25

Α.

Exhibit 59, correct?

Yes.

22

23

24

25

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 48 of 111 July 09, 2024 Pagel Dominique Delagnes Page 189 Page 191 following it and we will -unacceptable UDC-A proficiency test survey results, 2 2 MR. CORNFELD: I don't -- I don't correct? 3 even know if it would require an expert to testify 3 A. Yes. 4 about this report. That's why I'm saying, 4 Q. And they had a question about it, and obviously if it would require an expert to testify 5 then they wanted you to submit the acknowledgment about it, then we would find out who's going to form, correct? 6 6 7 testify about it when we get your expert reports. 7 Α. Yes. 8 MR. CEJAS: I think vou've --8 And by "you," I meant Averhealth. 9 MR. CORNFELD: But --9 You understood that? 10 MR. CEJAS: Look. I mean, she had 10 Well, you mean Dr. Glinn because now some factual involvement with 8. She's going 11 I'm --11 testify about those things you've heard about. Her 12 12 Well -- well, they wanted Averhealth 13 firsthand involvement, sure, and we'll follow the 13 to submit the signed acknowledgment form. 14 rules with respect to expert opinions. A. Well, it specifically has Dr. Glinn's 14 15 (A discussion was held off the 15 name on it, but yes. 16 record.) 16 Q. Okay. And Exhibit 61 is Averhealth's 17 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 17 response to that -- that request and providing the (A discussion was held off the additional information that CAP said it needed, 18 18 19 record.) 19 correct? 20 (BY MR. CORNFELD) You have in front 20 Α. Q. of you Exhibit 60, which is a letter from CAP dated 21 21 And in Exhibit 61, Dr. Glinn refers 22 March 10, 2021, signed by Lena Portillo to 22 to items that -- that she submitted with the 23 Dr. Glinn with a Bates number 37207 and Exhibit 61, 23 letter, correct? a letter from Averhealth to CAP -- to Ms. Portillo 24 A. There was the letter, the response. with CAP dated March 17, 2021, numbered 17105 on What do you mean the -- is there something else

1 that you're referring to? There's a letter and an

2 acknowledgment form.

> 3 Q. I'm sorry. Strike that. Strike that question.

5 Are you familiar with the fact that

6 Dr. Schwilke was preparing a macro for Averhealth?

7 Yes. Α.

8 What was that macro?

10 data and put it into a graphical representation.

For the ability to help take the QC

11 Q. And Aver -- excuse me, as CAP said it

12 needed?

9

17

13 Α. I don't recall.

14 Q. I mean, that was something that CAP 15 wanted, correct?

16 A. Are you referring to a specific

Q. I believe they did request it, but if 18

document where they requested that?

19 you don't recall, we can go on. 20

Okay.

21 Are you -- are you familiar with the fact that Dr. Schwilke told Averhealth that it

23 needed to -- it needed help with its QC review

24 program for LC-MS/MS? 25

MR. CEJAS: Object to the extent --

Page 190

the first page. 1

2 Do you see those?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Are you familiar with those?

A. Not beforehand, but reading them, 5 6 yes. I mean, I don't recall them from now, but I 7

just read them. 8

Q. Okay. Other than -- other than just reading them, do you recall them from when they 9

10 were sent and received?

11 A. I don't remember them. It was three 12 years ago.

13 Q. Okay. Well, we don't have to spend 14 much time on them anyway --

15 A. Okay.

16 -- but on March 10, 2021, in

17 Exhibit 60, CAP asked for additional information

from Averhealth, correct? 18

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And for example, they wanted to

21 know -- they wanted the corrective actions

22 submitted for a certain PT referred to as UDC-A,

23 correct?

888-893-3767

24 Α. Yes.

25 And an investigation of the

Page: 49 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 193 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) And that dated May 13, 2021, signed by Amy Daniels 2 Dr. Schwilke was going to help with that? 3 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Assumes 3 CAP Accreditation Program.

5

6

5 But subject to that, go ahead.

THE WITNESS: What I am familiar with 6 is the fact that he assisted -- he said that he

knows how to write a macro to help with putting

together large data for the QCs, yes. 9

10 Q. Okay. That's the macro?

facts not in evidence.

11 A. Yes.

4

12 Q. Do you recall that Dr. Schwilke told

13 Averhealth that its Levey-Jennings review needed to

be improved? 14

15 A. That was a recommendation that he

16 made on his interim inspection, yes. I do -- I

17 just read that in his interim inspection.

18 Q. Okay. Other than reading that in the

19 interim inspection, aside from what you just read

in his interim inspection report --20

21 Α. Okay.

22 Q. -- were you familiar with that?

23 Α.

1

24 All right. So you wouldn't be Q.

familiar with what he thought needed to be improved 25

Technical Director of Accreditation Services of the

4 Do you have that?

> Yes. Α.

Q. Is this the letter where CAP informed

Averhealth that it was going to be doing a

8 nonroutine inspection, and what that would entail?

9

10 Q. At least in very general terms?

11 Yes.

12 All right. And it -- it states

that -- and by the way, this was the day the

inspection occurred, correct?

15 A. I don't believe it was -- okay.

16 Do you recall --

17 A. It was around -- it was around

May 13th, so yes, this was either a day or around 18

19 the day. So this may have been the day that --

20 that the inspection occurred.

21 Q. I take it you don't have any

22 independent recollection of that, of whether this

23 was the very day that the inspection occurred?

It was around this date, yes.

Okay. But whether this was the exact

Page 194

24

25

3

or how to improve it?

A. Again, what I know is what's written 2 3 in the interim inspection that he performed for us.

4 Q. Okay. I'm asking for your

5 independent knowledge --

A. Okay. 6

Q. -- besides what's in that document 7

8 that you just read.

9 A. No, I'm not.

10 Do you know what Levey-Jennings

11 charts are?

12 A. I do.

13 Q. What are they?

14 A. They're graphical representation of

-- I believe a quality control. Again, let's leave 15

16 this question for Dr. Glinn.

17 She -- all right. She would -- this

would be the kind of technical --18

19 Α. Yes.

20 Q. -- question that we need --

21 Α. Yes.

22 Q. -- to inquire of Dr. Glinn?

23 Yes.

888-893-3767

I've handed you what's been marked as 24

25 Exhibit 62, which is a letter from CAP to Dr. Glinn date is my question. You don't have any

independent recollection of that? 2

> Α. No.

Okay. And it says that: This

inspection will be a condition of probation and to

validate compliance with accreditation requirements 6

due to complaints filed against the laboratory. 7

8 Do you see that?

9 Yes.

10 Q. And there are -- it says: The

11 allegations of noncompliance are -- and then it

lists six allegations, correct? 12

13 Α. Yes.

14 Q. The first four are the ones they told

you about when they first told you about the

allegations in November, and when they told you 16

17 that you were being put on probation in January,

18 correct?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And then number 5 is: Concern with a

21 repeated pattern of releasing false positive

22 results. And number 6: Lack of compliance with

23 the CAP terms of accreditation related to adverse

24 media alleging false positive drug results.

Do you see that?



Page 196

25

Page: 50 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 197 Page 199 A. Yes. Q. True? Okay. 1 2 2 Q. Did CAP ever tell you where they got Could that have been an article in 3 those last two allegations, number 5 and 6? 3 the St. Louis Record, the one that was -- the media item referred to in paragraph 6? 4 A. They showed me while they were on 4 site for the inspection of an article that was in a 5 I believe so. 5 Δ. 6 legal journal, I think in St. Louis. Q. Okay. The name St. Louis Record 7 Q. And that article was what? sounds familiar? 8 I don't recall, and it wasn't even 8 A. Yes. I think I'd said it was a media. It was Dr. Zebelman showed it to me, and it something published in a journal or law journal was something that we had never seen before. The 10 that was here in St. Louis. first time that I had seen it was at -- anybody at 11 Q. And even if it's a publication that Averhealth had ever seen it was the day of the is limited to the -- to the universe of lawyers, 12 13 inspection. 13 that would still be media, wouldn't it? 14 Q. Okay. And -- and so -- that relates 14 A. The first that we learned that it was 15 to number 6? 15 even out there for us to report it to CAP was when 16 A. Correct. 16 Dr. Zebelman showed it to me when he was on site. 17 Q. All right. Did you ever learn what 17 Q. Okay. So I take it you said we the -- where they -- the source of number 5 is, couldn't have reported to you, we never heard of 18 18 19 concern with the repeated pattern of releasing 19 this? 20 false positive results? 20 A. I told them that that's the first 21 No. time I'd seen it. Α. 21 22 22 Okay. But that was after you had And so they never told you that was 23 from Dr. Riley; is that right? 23 received the letter where they had that allegation, 24 A. That's right. 24 correct? 25 25 Did they tell you that that had MR. CEJAS: Objection. Assumes facts Page 198 Page 200 anything to do with Dr. Riley's testimony about not in evidence. Which letter?

30 percent -- that 30 percent of the tests were --

4 A. As I said, they didn't tell me where

in Michigan were inaccurate?

5 it came from.

6 Okay. Okay. I --Q.

7 I said I don't know where it came

8 from.

3

9 Q. Well, regardless of where it came

from, I take it that they didn't tell you that it 10

11 related to that claim by Dr. Riley, correct?

12 They didn't tell me where it came

13 from.

17

14 Q. I mean, they might not have said --

15 So how would I know? They didn't

16 tell me where it came from.

Q. Okay. But I take it -- but where it

18 came from, meaning who told them that, who made the

complaint, but somebody else could have told them 19

20 that Dr. Riley had said that. So I take it what

21 you're saying is CAP never told you that allegation

22 number 5 in Exhibit 62 had anything to do with

23 Dr. Riley's statement that 30 percent of the tests

24 in Michigan were inaccurate?

25 A. That is correct. 2 MR. CORNFELD: Exhibit 62.

3 THE WITNESS: I don't understand the

4 question.

5 (BY MR. CORNFELD) When -- when you

received Exhibit 62 --6

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. -- the letter that referred to the

allegation number 6 about lack of compliance 9

related to adverse media, at the time he handed you 10

this letter, or somebody delivered the letter to

you, you were not aware of that St. Louis Record

13 publication; is that a fair statement?

14 Α. Yes.

15 Q. You've been handed Exhibit 63, which

is a document titled College of American 16

17 Pathologists Laboratory Accreditation Program

Inspector Summary Report. Correct? 18

A. Summation report, yes.

20 Q. Summation report. Thank you.

And that has the Bates number 16940

22 on the first page.

Are you familiar with this document?

24 Yes. Α.

19

21

23

25 Did you see this in preparation for



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 51 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 201 Page 203 your corporate designee deposition yesterday? section unit, lab general.

2

3

2

A. I saw the -- in that different

format. So they leave individual sheets.

Not stapled together?

5 They're for each section. It's the

same thing, it's just in individual pages. They 6

leave an inspection report on site, so this is out

of CAP's computer system, but there's another

report that the inspectors fill out and hand to you 9

while they're on site. It's basically the same

11 thing. It's just in a different format.

12 I've handed you what's been marked as

13 Exhibit 64, which is a document with the heading

College of American Pathologists CAP Accreditation 14

15 Programs Deficiency Response Sheet. Are you

16 familiar with this document?

17 A. Yes.

3

4

And does this contain the handwritten 18

19 notes that you just referred to?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Okay. Along with Averhealth's

22 response?

23 Α. Yes.

24 And then Exhibit 64 has the -- for

25 the record, has the Bates number 21604 on the first Okay. And then --

I believe that it might be on here.

There's various sections, so DRA, so it's referring

to the checklist. So I'm making an assumption that

it's on the checklist of lab general. So at the

top here, it says: Avertest d/b/a section lab

general checklist laboratory general. So there's

a -- there's different checklists, so I quess it's

the section of lab general, and then the individual

checklist. So this would have been what CAP

12 defines as a section of lab general.

13 Q. Okay. And -- and there are three

14 checklist items that the inspectors address on

15 page 2, correct?

16 Α. Yes.

And the inspectors, by the way, they 17 Q.

were Dr. Zebelman -- and do you recall who the 18

19 other one was?

20 Dr. Peat, I think.

21 Yeah, that's P-E-A-T?

22 Mike P-E-A-T, yes. Α.

Okay. And do you see the first item

24 on page 2 has to do with the laboratory director

ensuring an effective quality management program

Page 202

23

3

11

12

18

22

1 page.

2 So if we would look at Exhibit 63.

3 which I referred to as the -- as the typed

inspection notes from the interim inspection --

excuse me, the nonroutine inspection, when -- do

you see that it is dated July 28th, 2021? 6

7

8 But the inspection date was May 13th,

9 2021, correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 And -- and this contains various

inspector comments, correct? 12

13 Α. Yes.

14 Q. And if we look at the second page of

the document, which is called page 2 of 6, do you 15

16 see that these are comments related to lab general?

17 A. Well, the first one is DRA 10440.

The second one and third one are lab general. Is 18

19 that what you mean? Or you mean the top, the

20 section unit?

21 Q. It -- it says -- it says lab general.

22 A. Okay. Sorry. I was reading the ID

23 numbers down the side.

24 What does lab general mean?

25 I'm not sure. Because it says

for the laboratory. 1

2 Do you see that?

Yes.

4 Q. And the inspector comments on this

item, says trends in the quantitative results of

proficiency test results are ignored. As specified

in the deficiency marked for GEN.20318, trend 7

8 analysis and response is absent for urinary [sic]

9 creatinine. And then there are various scientific

10 notations.

Do you see that?

A. Yes.

13 All right. So -- so in this

14 inspection, Dr. Zebelman and Dr. -- and Peat found

that Averhealth was ignoring trends in the

quantitative results of proficiency test results, 16

17 something they should have been doing, correct?

A. They commented that we need to do 19 more around tracking trends, yes.

20 Q. Well, he didn't say you needed to do 21 more. He said you were ignoring the trends, and so

you need to pay attention to them, correct? 23 He used the words, yes, that we were

24 ignoring the trends.

25 Q. All right. And you --



Page 204

Danel Dominique Delagnes

Page 205 A. Yes, trends of quantitation results 2 and proficiency tests were ignored. Those were his words. responses you sent back to CAP regarding the Q. Okav. And did you tell him that you

would stop ignoring and you would start paying

attention to those?

7 A. We had indicated that -- that we

would provide updated documentation of us. So the

response from Dr. Glinn on that is that quality

control runs have always been tracked and analyzed

11 in a tabular form. During the on-site inspection,

the numerical results presented in a graphical

form. So they were always tracked and analyzed,

but it was done in a tabular form, not in a

graphical form. So we had said moving forward, not

16 only would we track it in an Excel tabular form,

but that we'd move it to a graphical 17

18 representation.

19 Q. You're -- you're referring to the

20 first page of Exhibit 64?

A. Of 64, yes, I am. Our response to 21

22 the deficiency DRA 10440.

23 Q. And -- and --

24 A. So we didn't say that it was ignored,

we just said that we did it in a tabular form, not

portion of Exhibit 64 that consist of pages

entitled Deficiency Response Sheet, those are the

July 09, 2024

Page 207

Page 208

deficiencies that the inspectors found in the

5 nonroutine inspection?

6 Α. Yes.

7 All right. And is that Dr. Glinn's

handwriting on those pages in Exhibit 64?

A. Yes.

10 Q. And Dr. Glinn says: The laboratory

has hired someone -- strike that. 11

12 With respect to the tracking of

13 trends in the PT results, Dr. Glinn says in Exhibit

64: The laboratory has hired someone to assist

with setting these up for all drugs across all 15

16 specimen types.

Who was being hired to do that?

18 A. You'd need to ask Dr. Glinn. That 19 might be where she's referring to Dr. Schwilke, but 20 I'm not sure, to help us.

21 Q. I mean, Dr. Schwilke, you said, was

22 an employee, so he was already hired.

A. You're right. I don't know. You

24 need to ask Dr. Glinn. I don't recall who she was

25 hiring.

17

23

1

Page 206 a graphical representation.

Q. Dr. Zebelman and Dr. Peat knew that 2

3 you were doing it in a tabular form, but not a

graphical form, correct?

5 A. Yes.

6 All right. And he considered that --

that doing it that way was essentially ignoring the

8 trends, correct?

9 MR. CEJAS: Object to the extent it

10 calls for speculation.

11 But go ahead.

12 THE WITNESS: He stated that in -- in

13 his inspection report, as you already indicated,

14 that trends in quantitative results of proficiency

15 test are ignored. They wanted it to be done in a

16 different way. They were always tracked, they just

17 were not tracked in graphical form.

18 Q. I understand that. And he knew that

you were doing that, and to -- they knew that --

20 the inspectors knew that you were doing that, and

21 what they said about what that meant was that meant

22 that the trends were being ignored, correct?

23 That's what they said?

24 That's what they said, yes.

25 And in -- by the way, Exhibit 64, the Okay. All right. And then it says:

This will be completed in the next 30 days, and 2

3 then moving forward, updated continuously and

4 reviewed weekly.

5 Do you see that?

6 Yes.

7 Q. And it also says: The IT support

team is working on a project to integrate QC data 8

9 into our LIMS for tracking purposes. It is hoped

10 that this program will be in process by the last

quarter of 2021.

12 Do you see that on the first page of

13 Exhibit 64?

14 A. Yes.

15 The first quarter of 2021 would mean that that program would be in process between 16

17 August 1st and December 31st of December 2021,

18 correct?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. I -- I don't see a date on the

21 deficiency response sheet or on the first page. Do

22 you know when this was done?

23 A. I'd have to look. I don't know off the top of my head. I don't see a date either. 24

Okay. Perhaps we can find out from



25

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 53 of 111

Page Dominique Delagnes

July 09, 2024 Page 209 Page 211

Dr. Glinn. 2 Do you see -- going back to Exhibit 63, on the -- on page 2, continuing with the items that they list under Lab General, the

second item, which is that the QM program must

include processes for recording create --

7 corrective and preventative actions taken for

errors and incidents and so forth.

9 The inspector's comments were after 10 some scientific notation. It says: Further, the

Levey-Jennings plots or other graphical numerical 11

12 methods are not used to detect trends in day-to-day

13 QC. Thus, trends may not be detected. There is no

analysis of trends in the quantitative results of 14

15 PT surveys.

16 And then he uses as an example 17 something related to the PTs, survey called UDC-A.

Do you see that? 18

19 Α. Yes.

20 Q. And then he says: This is a

21 systematic issue in the QM and QC program.

22 Correct?

23 Α. Yes.

24 And in Exhibit 64, did Dr. Glinn

25 respond to that?

DRA.10440 --

1

2

6

Q. And the inspector's note is that the

2 CAP terms of accreditation are listed in the

laboratory's official notification of

accreditation. The written policy must include,

5 and then he lists what it must include.

Correct?

7 A. Yes.

6

8

Q. And in -- in response to that --

9 We had everything listed in our SOP

10 except who would be the --

11 Q. Excuse me, there's no question

pending. 12

13 In response to that, in Exhibit 64,

Dr. Glinn states on page 21606 that: This was

corrected on site, and the policy was amended to

16 specify the lab director and chief operating

17 officer.

18

Correct?

19 A. To whom would notify. So we had this 20 entire thing listed except for what was not listed

in this. So in our original SOP, it outlined all 21

of the CAP accreditation standards except for it 22

23 did not indicate, if there was adverse media, who

24 would be the one to notify CAP. So we updated that

to specify that it would either be the lab director

Page 210

A. Yes. She said: As mentioned in

3 Q. Excuse me. Are you referring to a

page with a Bates number 21065?

5 A. Yes, I am.

Okay. And --

7 So you can tell the corresponding

8 numbers. So at the top, it says requirement number

9 GEN.20318. So this is the response to that.

10 Q. Okay. And -- and --

A. The evaluation of PT results will 11

include examination of the CAP performance, 12

13 analytics dashboard, and the appropriate action

14 taken if results are unsatisfactory.

15 Q. Okay. So this is another deficiency

that the inspectors found that Dr. Glinn told CAP 16

17 that Averhealth's going to take care of, correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 And then the last item on the second

20 page of Exhibit 63 is -- refers to the requirement

21 that the laboratory have a written policy that

22 addresses compliance with the CAP terms of

23 accreditation.

24 Do you see that?

25 A. I do. 1 or the chief operating officer to do so.

2 Q. Okay. And that was something that

3 you did while the inspectors were on site at the

4 lab?

6

5 A. Correct, we updated the SOP then.

And -- and by your -- I don't want to

read anything into it that's not appropriate, but

by your tone of voice. I take it you considered

that this is not as serious a finding as the other

10 two that we talked about.

11 A. I don't know why you're reading that

into my voice. I'm just explaining what had

13 happened because in the previous statement, you

14 said there wasn't a question pending. So I was

15 just explaining this particular one.

16 Q. You considered that this wasn't as

17 serious as the other two violations on this page?

18 We take anything where they want us to make adjustments to our processes or -- as 19

20 procedures. I don't think that one is more serious

21 than the other.

22 Q. Okay. And on page 3 of the -- of

23 Exhibit 63, that's just a continuation of what

24 the -- the policy we've been talking about must

25 include, correct? Page 212

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 54 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 213 Page 215 A. Correct. that that wasn't done adequately because it didn't 2 Regarding either of the other two specify who was responsible. This is the one where 3 findings that the inspectors made on the second it said -- they said you didn't indicate who was 3 4 page of Exhibit 63, the one where they said that responsible to report adverse media attention, and you were ignoring quantitative results and that -- that he noted was corrected on site, proficiency test results, and the one that you 6 correct? weren't using -- you weren't doing the 7 A. Yes. Levey-Jennings analysis correctly, did you go back 8 On exhibit -- excuse me. On page 5 and review your past tests with regard to the --9 of Exhibit -- of Exhibit 63, this relates to the 10 the PT trends or the Levey-Jennings analysis? 10 section unit called Confirmation. 11 A. When you say past tests, what do you 11 Yes. Α. 12 mean by that? 12 And the first item says: The results 13 Q. Before May 13th, before the date of of controls are that -- this is the requirement 14 this inspection. that the results of controls are reviewed for 15 A. Are you talking about our PT results? acceptability before reporting results. 15 16 Q. Yeah, to go back and do a -- do a 16 Correct? A. Yes. 17 trend analysis that he said you weren't doing and 17 to --18 18 And his comment was that the lab's 19 You'd have to ask Dr. Glinn that. 19 SOP on LC-MS/MS, quality control section two 20 Q. -- and to do the Levey -- and to do 20 describes quantitation methods and shifts in 21 the Levey-Jennings analysis. 21 retention times, variations in IS, meaning internal 22 22 A. You'd have to ask Dr. Glinn. I do standards, where calibrator recovery or to select a 23 know that -- that they stated that. What we had 23 better fitting regression model. 24 done to track trends before that is every six 24 To begin with, this section is 25 months, we did what is considered an instrument confusing. However, the impression left is that it Page 216 Page 214 comparison. So by the instrument comparison, you allows the lab flexibility in approving a batch of would take all of your quality control results specimens for reporting. Furthermore, there is 3 across all the instruments, you plot it on a graph, disagreement and/or complete -- incomplete match with the training manual. For example, the use of and it shows you the trends. 5 So we did have trend information, 5 different calibration curves. they just wanted us to -- to change what we were 6 Do you see that? 7 doing, but we did track trends. 7 Yes. Α. 8 Q. But -- but not adequately according 8 So that -- that was their finding of 9 to their findings, correct? 9 a deficiency when they inspected you on May 13, 10 10 2021? A. That's what they indicated, yes. 11 Oh, sorry. 11 A. They wanted us to update our SOPs to 12 If we look at page 4 of the report of 12 be more clear, yes. 13 Okay. And in response --

13 the May 13th, 2021, nonroutine CAP analysis in 14 Exhibit 63 --15 A. Which page? 16 Page 4. Q. 17 Page 4, thank you. 18 Page 4 of 6. This relates to a requirement to adhere to the certificate marked 19

21 mark and design, if the laboratory is or will use 22 the CAP certification mark.

terms of use/agreement for the CAP certification

23 Do you see that?

24 l do. Α.

20

25 And -- and the inspector commented

14 A. Do you want me to read it?

I'm just -- I'm finding the page.

16 A. It's 21607.

15

17 Yes. Okay. In the -- in Dr. Glinn's

18 deficiency response sheet, she says: The LC-MS/MS

quality control SOP has been updated to be more 19

20 specific regarding the certification process for

21 reporting LC-MS/MS test results. In addition,

22 training document has been incorporated into the

23 LC-MS/MS quality control SOP. See attached

24 LC-MS/MS quality control SOP.

25 That's what -- that's what she told



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 55 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 217 Page 219

CAP in -- in response to this finding, correct? 1 The last page of Exhibit 63, which 2 A. Yes. 2 are the laboratory inspection-type notes relates to 3 Q. And that -- that she was updating the screening, and they found no deficiencies there, 3 -- the standard operating procedure to comply with 4 correct? the -- with CAP's requirement, correct? 5 A. What page? 6 A. To be more clear, yes. 6 The last page 7 Yeah, to comply with -- or to correct 7 Correct. 8 the deficiency that inspectors found, correct? 8 Handing you what's been marked as 9 A. To -- to be more clear, yes. 9 Exhibit 65. 10 Q. Okay. But that was to correct what 10 Α. Are we done with these? 11 they found was a deficiency, correct? Q. Yes. 11 12 A. Yes. 12 You've been handed Exhibit 65, which 13 Okay. And that -- that revised SOP 13 14 of CAP dated May 20th, 2021, correct?

is attached to Exhibit 64 beginning with 21629, 14 15 correct? 16 Sorry, I'm just looking at one thing.

17 First, could you answer my question?

18 A. I didn't hear your question because I

19 wanted -- they differentiate between recommendation

20 and deficiency, and I just want to confirm that

that was actually listed as a deficiency. That's 21

22 what I was looking for.

Can you repeat your question, please? 23

24 Q. It was a deficiency, correct?

25 I was still trying to figure it out

is an e-mail exchange between you and Lena Portillo

15 Α. Yes.

Yes.

16 This was one week after the 17 nonroutine inspection we've been talking about,

18 correct?

Α.

19

20 Q. And in your e-mail that initiates --

21 by the way, for the record, the Bates number, first 22

page of this is 19194. 23 In the e-mail that initiates this

exchange, you wrote on May 20th, 2021, at

25 9:44 a.m.: Good morning, Lena. We wanted to

Page 218

and you asked me to answer your question, so I haven't had a chance to do either. 2

3 Q. Okay. Let's -- the -- the revised

LC-MS/MS quality control standard operating

5 procedure was attached to the deficiency --

6 A. Yes.

Q. -- response sheets beginning on 7

8 21629, correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And that has a -- a handwritten date.

11 I know the copy's not very good, but it has a

12 handwritten date of May 24, 2021, correct?

13 Α. Yes.

14 I believe there's also a typed

version that was produced, but this will do for 15

16 now.

17 So -- so was this -- what they said

about the LC-MS/MS quality control SOP, was this a 18

deficiency? 19

20 A. It was.

21 Q. Okay. And so were the others that

22 they talked about, correct?

23 Yes.

24 All right. And then the last page of

25 Exhibit 63, which relates to -- strike that.

Page 220 follow up regarding our special inspection that

took place by Dr. Zebelman and Dr. Peat on May 13,

3 2021. Based on the outbrief -- and let me stop

4 there.

5 What did you mean by "outbrief"?

6 At the end of the inspection when they produce these documents, that's called an

outbrief. So the inspectors, along with whomever

9 from the laboratory team want to participate, they

go through the -- their findings. 10

11 Q. And you say: It was shared by both

Dr. Zebelman and Dr. Peat that they did not find

13 any evidence if the allegations of noncompliance

14 were true or any evidence that we are reporting

15 false positive test results.

16 Do you see that?

A. I do.

17

Q. And in response, Ms. Portillo states 18

19 that same afternoon: Good morning, Dominique.

20 Thank you for your e-mail. The next steps, and she

21 says what the next steps for the laboratory -- was

22 for the laboratory responses to be received and

23 reviewed for compliance, followed by commissioner

review, and then the laboratory would be presented 24

25 for whether or not probation would be removed.



Page: 56 of 111 .lulv 09, 2024 Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24

uo	Pagel Dominigue	July 09, 2024
1	Page 221	Page 223 1 MR. CORNFELD: All over my question?
2		2 COURT REPORTER: All over it.
3		3 MR. CORNFELD: All right. Would you
4	_	4 read the question and answer before that?
5		5 (The preceding question and answer
6		6 was read back.)
7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) So in response to
8		8 what what you said and we'll get to what you
6	•	9 said about false positives, but in response to your
1	·	10 statement that you understood that the inspectors
1	•	11 found that the allegations of noncompliance were
1:		
	, ,	12 not true, she said essentially no, the allegations
1:		13 were all substantiated, and the purpose of the
14		14 probation and documentation submissions were to
1:		15 monitor progress with compliance. And the purpose
1		16 of the inspection was to verify that you were
1		17 implementing corrections, and that you were
1	• •	18 continuing to be in compliance, correct?
1		MR. CEJAS: Object to the form of the
2	•	20 question. It assumes facts not in evidence, calls
2	·	21 for speculation as to someone else's intent.
2		Subject to that, go ahead.
2	·	23 THE WITNESS: In my sentence, it was
2	, ,	24 a compound sentence that I wrote.
2	5 allegations of noncompliance were not true, what	25 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Okay.
1	Page 222 she's saying is the allegations were all	Page 224 1 A. Okay? So
2		2 Q. I want to address the first part of
3		3 what you wrote. All right? What you wrote
4		4 A. As long as I have an opportunity to
5		5 address
6		6 Q. We're going to
7		7 A the second part of what I wrote.
8		8 Q. Absolutely. I'm dying to ask you
9		9 about it. Okay? But the you what you said
1		10 to Dr excuse me, to Ms. Portillo of CAP when
1		11 you wrote her a week after the inspection was that
1:		12 you thought that the inspectors didn't find any
1:		13 evidence that the allegations of noncompliance were
1.	. •	14 true.
1:	, and the second se	15 And what she wrote back was to the
10	•	16 contrary, the allegations were all substantiated.
1		17 The purpose of the probation and document
18		18 submissions were to monitor progress with
19	<u> </u>	19 compliance and the inspection was to verify that
2	•	20 you were implementing corrections and continuing
2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	21 with compliance.
2	2 MR. CORNFELD: Would you reread the	22 Correct?
2	•	23 A. Yes.
Ι.		



Q. Okay. And you also said that you

25 understood that they did not find evidence that you

24

COURT REPORTER: I can't because she

24

25 talked all over you.

July 09, 2024

Page: 57 of 111 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 225 Page 227 were reporting false positive test results, and she Q. And for the record, the Bates number 1 2 2 did not respond to that at all, did she? is 48954. Are you familiar with this letter? 3 A. She did not. 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. She didn't say whether that what you 4 Q. And do you see that it states: The 5 said was correct or incorrect? College of American Pathologists, or CAP, 5 6 accreditation program has reviewed the inspector 6 A. When they came -- that is correct. 7 Okay. Thank you. According to the findings concerning the complaints -- complaint CAP letter of May 13th, and according to what we that we received. read that Dr. Glinn submitted, you were required to Do you see that? 9 10 submit responses to the deficiencies within 30 days 10 A. Yes. 11 after the submission -- after the inspection. 11 Q. And it says: The allegations were 12 reviewed and determined to be not applicable to the Was that what we were looking at in 12 13 terms of the deficiency response sheets? 13 testing performed under the CAP-FDT program. 14 A. Yes. 14 Do you see that? 15 Q. So that -- that would have been 15 A. Yes. 16 submitted by -- at least by June 12th, if you 16 Is it your view that -- or what do 17 complied with that 30-day requirement, correct? 17 you understand that this letter means? 18 18 A. Yes. A. At our laboratory, we have two SOPs. So we have specimens that fall under the CLIA SOP 19 So we can put a date on it. 19 20 You've been handed what's been marked and specimens that fall under the CAP SOP. So they're saying that this followed the CLIA SOP, so 21 Exhibit 66, which is a letter on the letterhead of 21 22 the College of American Pathologists dated June 17, 22 it was not applicable to their program. 23 23 2021, to Dr. Glinn from Lena Portillo. Can I see your exhibit? 24 Do you have that? 24 A. Yes. 25 I don't see a reference to CLIA.

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And in this letter. Ms. Portillo asks for additional information, correct? 2 3 Α. Yes. Q. And she indicates that the 4 5 investigation is not completed, correct? Or at

6 least this indicates --7 A. It doesn't state --Q. I'm sorry. 8

9 A. -- she did not state --

10 Q. No, I'm sorry --

11 Α. -- that the investigation was still 12 ongoing.

13 I'm sorry. That was the conclusion 14 we can draw, the investigation is not completed, 15 correct?

16 A. We provided our response and she 17 asked for supplemental information, yes.

18 Q. Handing you what's been marked as 19 Exhibit 67. Do you see that this is a letter on

20 the letterhead of College of American Pathologists

21 by Dr. Earle S. Collum, M.D., who's the Complaints

22 and Investigations Committee Chair of the CAP

23 Accreditation Programs, and it's directed to

24 Dr. Glinn dated May 25th, 2021?

25 Α. Yes. Page 226

Page 228 A. You asked me what it meant, and I was explaining what it meant, and I'm explaining to you why it says determined not applicable to the

testing performed under CAP-FDT. So the fact that they said that, I

was trying to explain to you we have two SOPs. Right? We was specimens that fall -- a CLIA SOP

and specimens that follow a CAP SOP. So when --

the reason why they sent this to us is we showed

them that the particular complaint that they were investigating here did not follow the specimens

12 that are tested under the CAP-FDT program.

13 Q. Okay. That's -- that -- I've seen 14 documents related to that, and I didn't think they were particularly pertinent. That was a different complaint you received, correct? Not -- not the 16

17 complaint that arose out of Dr. Riley, correct?

18 Correct, it's a different reference

19 number.

20 Q. Okay. Okay. So Exhibit 67, the letter from -- the letter dated May 25th, 2021, 21

from CAP to Averhealth has nothing to do with

23 Dr. Riley's complaints, correct?

24 A. Correct.

25 So if anybody were to suggest that



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 58 of 111

Page 229

July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 231

this letter meant that CAP had exonerated

Averhealth of the -- of Dr. Riley's complaints,

that would just be not true, correct? 3

4 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form.

Specific as to exonerate. 5

Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go ahead.

7 A. Ask the question again.

Q. If anyone were to suggest that

Exhibit 67 means that CAP exonerated Averhealth of 9

Dr. Riley's allegations, that would not be correct? 10

MR. CEJAS: Same --11

12 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Isn't that --

13 isn't that right?

A. This reference number is different 14

15 than -- than her allegations, correct.

16 MR. CORNFELD: How long we been

17 going?

6

8

18 MR. CEJAS: I lost track of it.

19 MR. CORNFELD: Why don't we take a

20 break, and I think then we can be in the

21 homestretch.

22 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is

23 3:24 p.m. We are off the record.

24 (A short break was taken.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 25

investigation found that the laboratory was out of

compliance with the CAP standards for laboratory

accreditation with respect to four allegations, 3

correct? 4

6

5 Α. Yes.

Q. And they list those allegations, and

that they're -- they're the same ones we've been

looking at that Dr. Riley made to CAP going back to

October, correct? 9

10 A. November, but yes, correct.

Q. I thought she submitted it -- oh, 11

you're right, November, November 2020? 12

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. They don't say anything about what

was listed as allegation number 5 in the May 13 15

16 letter, Exhibit 62, concerned with the repeated

17 pattern of releasing false positive results,

correct? 18

23

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. They don't say whether they found

21 that that was substantiated or found that it was

22 not substantiated, correct?

A. Correct. But through the entire

process, they never told us we had incorrect test 24

results, they never had us update any test results.

Page 230

3:44 p.m. We are back on the record.

2 (BY MR. CORNFELD) Ms. Delagnes, you

3 have in front of you Exhibit 68, which is a letter

from the College of American Pathologists dated

July 29, 2021, to Dr. Glinn signed by Michael B. 6 Datto, M.D., PhD, CAP's accreditation committee

7 chair.

8

Do you see that?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. You familiar with this letter?

11 Α. Yes.

12 This is the letter where CAP told you

13 that they were lifting the probation, correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And they said the reason was that

Averhealth had made what they called significant 16

17 progress in correcting deficiencies identified

18 during their investigation of the complaint,

19 correct?

20 Α. Yes.

21 And that was -- and this relates to

22 the complaint based on Dr. Riley's allegations,

23 correct?

24 Α. Yes.

25 Q. And they -- they also state that the Obviously, as you've indicated, they did an

incredibly thorough investigation. Through that,

if they believed that we reported incorrect test

results, they would have asked us to reanalyze them

and re-report them or update procedures. They

never came and said, hey, your results are wrong. They asked us to make some changes to our

8 processes.

Okay. I -- I have not seen any 9 Ω

communication from CAP to Averhealth addressing a 10

complaint regarding false positives other than what

is set forth in the letter of May 13. Are you

13 aware of any letter like that?

14 A. Not a letter, but through their

investigation --15

16 Q. Or no, any communication from CAP to

17 you where they specifically address an allegation

of false positives, other than the May 13, 2021 --18

19 A. No.

20 Q. -- letter. Are you aware of such a

21 communication?

22 Α. No.

23 Okay. When did you first acknowledge

24 to customers -- by "you," I mean Averhealth -- that

CAP had put Averhealth on probation?



Page 232

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 59 of 111

Page Dominique Delagnes

July 09, 2024

Page 235

Page 233

A. I don't know off the top of my head.

2 I'd have to look back through documentation.

- 3 Was that after there was an article
- 4 about it in -- on the vice com website?
- 5 A. Yes.

6

- Q. And that was in February of 2023?
- 7 A. If that's what you have record of.
- 8 Again, I'd have to look. I don't know the date off
- 9 the top of my head.
- 10 Q. All right. I'm not going to show you
- the letter, the article, and we're not going to go 11
- 12 through it, but will you accept my representation
- 13 that that was February 2023?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. So that was actually two years after
- 16 CAP put you -- put Averhealth on probation, and
- 17 Averhealth only acknowledged that fact publicly
- when it was already public through a media 18
- 19 publication, correct?
- 20 A. Yes.

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

know why.

Α.

Q.

Q.

Α.

Α.

those.

correct?

Yes.

- 21 O. Was that being transparent, in
- 22 Averhealth's view?
- 23 A. We'd already covered why -- that we
- 24 made a business decision not to tell customers.

Averhealth did make an effort to reach out to its

A. We proactively notified some; and

others, as they were asked about it, we let them

25 Okay. After the -- after the Vice

article was published in February of 2023,

customers to provide its explanation and its

Q. Okay. You let them know what

happened and what those events were, correct?

A. Not why they lifted it. What --

it. I don't understand the question.

Okay. Thank you.

Do you have that?

Yes.

which appears to be a slide deck entitled:

Averhealth CAP-FDT Accreditation Complaint,

Temporary Probation, and Corrective Actions.

Can you -- are you familiar with

And why CAP lifted the probation,

there was nothing in there about why they lifted

Let's -- let's take a look at one of

You have in front of you Exhibit 69,

version of what happened, correct?

this? 1

3

6

- 2 Α. Yes. Q.
- 4 This is a document that we put

What is this?

- 5 together that outlined the process.
 - Q. All right. And it's the subtitle
- that says: Complaint, temporary probation, and
- corrective actions, correct?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And if we would look at the summary
- page, which is the second page, page 2, do you see
- 12 there's a paragraph that starts on July 28, 2021?
- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 Q. And it states: On July 28, 2021, the
- 15 CAP accreditation committee removed the probation
- 16 and indicated that the CAP inspector confirmed
- 17 significant Averhealth progress in correcting
- deficiencies, correct? 18
- 19 Yes.
- 20 So what you were telling customers
- 21 with this slide deck was that the reason why the
- 22 probation was lifted was that Averhealth had made
- 23 significant progress to correct deficiencies,
- 24 correct?
- 25 Yes.

Page 234 Page 236 One thing -- one thing you didn't say 1

- in this document to customers was what you have 2
- told us, which is that in your view, CAP rejected 3
- any allegation that Averhealth had false positives.
- You didn't say anything about false positives in
- 6 this document. Exhibit 69, that you sent to
- customers, did you? 7
- 8 A. What we did say, if you look on
- page 4, there are several bullets. Our certifying
- scientists have always had valid quality control
- 11 specimens prior to releasing test results is the
- 12 first bullet --

15

- 13 Q. Excuse me --
- 14 A. -- and the last bullet is --
 - -- that is -- that is --
- 16 A. -- Averhealth never releases positive
- 17 test results without the valid positive controls
- bracketing the patient specimens. 18
- 19 Okay. That's your statement to 20 customers that you believe your tests are valid.
- 21 What you didn't tell customers was that CAP had
- 22 found that you didn't have false positives, you
- 23 didn't say that in this slide deck that you sent to
- 24 customers about the CAP probation, did you?
- 25 A. I did not. It did not.



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 60 of 111

Page Dominique Delagnes

July 09, 2024 Page 237 Page 239 Averhealth did not; is that right? Q. that you didn't have false positives after 2 This document did not, yes. 2 investigating that complaint, if that were really Α. 3 3 the fact? Q. All right. Isn't that something you 4 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form. would want them to know if, in fact, that were the 5 case, that CAP had investigated a complaint that 5 (BY MR. CORNFELD) Can you think of a you had false positives and found that you didn't reason why you wouldn't want customers to know 6 7 have false positives? Would -- if that were really that? true, wouldn't you want customers to know that? 8 8 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form. 9 A. What we outlined --9 Argumentative and compound. 10 10 Q. Excuse me. If that were really true, Subject to that, go ahead. (BY MR. CORNFELD) It's a yes-or-no 11 wouldn't you want customers to know that? 11 Q. 12 A. In this --12 auestion. 13 Excuse me. Let me rephrase it and 13 MR. CEJAS: Same objections. Q. 14 Go ahead. 14 mavbe --15 Sure. 15 (BY MR. CORNFELD) And if -- and if Α. 16 16 the question is that there is a reason, then you -- you'll be able to answer it. 17 Is there any reason you wouldn't want 17 can tell me what's the reason, but is there any reason why you wouldn't want customers to know 18 customers to know that CAP had found that you 18 19 didn't have false positives, if that were really 19 that, yes --20 20 true? Α. Yes --21 Α. It's written in a different way. 21 Q. -- or no? 22 22 Q. You ---- we'd want customers to know that. 23 You would want customers to know 23 Α. So it shows points that we used valid 24 scientific results, right? So instead --24 that? 25 I'm talking about --25 Δ Yes. Page 238 Page 240 1 -- of making that specific But you didn't tell them that, did Q. 1 response -you? 2 2 3 Q. -- I'm talking about CAP's finding. 3 Α. We did --4 A. Okay. 4 No, you did not --Q. 5 Q. I'm talking not about your view 5 -- and that's what I was trying to that -- that you think your -- your results -- your 6 6 explain to you. procedures are fine. I'm talking about what CAP 7 7 -- you told them what you -- that you 8 found. If, in fact, CAP found, as you're telling us here, that you didn't have false positives, 9 10 that you didn't have false positives.

10 despite investigating whether you had false positives, isn't that -- is there any reason why 12 you wouldn't want customers to know that? 13 A. We, in this document --14 Q. Is there any reason why -- this is a yes-or-no question. Is there any reason why you 15 16 wouldn't want customers to say that? 17 Α. We did it in a way to go through them 18 in this. 19

No, I'm talking about CAP's findings, Q. not --Α. Okay. -- not your personal view bragging about your own procedures. I'm talking about the

independent CAP investigation. Is there any reason

you would not want customers to know that CAP found

20

21

22

23

24

25

thought your -- your procedures were correct. As you just told me, you did not say that CAP found

11 Those words are not in this --

MR. CEJAS: Hold on.

13 THE WITNESS: -- document.

14 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form.

Argumentative. 15

12

21

22

24

16 (BY MR. CORNFELD) Not just those 17 words, that sentiment, that idea, anything about 18 it, correct?

19 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form.

20 Argumentative.

Subject to that, go ahead.

Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Is that correct?

23 Α. No, it's not correct.

> Q. No, I'm saying --

No, it is not correct because through



Page: 61 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominigue Delagnes Page 241 Page 243 here -that you did not have false positives? 1 2 2 Q. It's not just the words about CAP. MR. CEJAS: Object to the form. 3 3 Argumentative. We're arguing with the witness now. Α. Okav. 4 It's not the -- nowhere would 4 Please go ahead and answer the Q. 5 somebody reading that -- excuse me, strike that. 5 question. 6 THE WITNESS: Those words, we did not 6 It's not just those words. You 7 didn't mention that you -- that CAP even use. 8 investigated whether you had false positives, did 8 (BY MR. CORNFELD) Look at the last 9 you? 9 bullet on the summary page of Exhibit 69. Do you 10 A. Through any investigation, as part of see that it says: Since removal of the probation 10 11 CAP's investigation process -in April and July 2022, CAP and CLIA --11 12 12 Q. I'm sorry, I'm talking about --A. I'm on the wrong page. Sorry. I was 13 A. -- and the responsibility as a 13 reading the last page. regulatory body --14 14 Q. The summary page. MR. CEJAS: Which -- which Bates 15 Q. I'm talking about what you --15 16 A. -- they have to determine whether or 16 number? Because I'm lost, too, actually. 17 not we have positive test results. 17 THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. CORNFELD: It's the -- it's the 18 Q. I'm talking about what you told 18 19 customers. Customers don't know what CAP does 19 second page of the exhibit, it's headed Summary. unless you tell them, and you said you would want 20 20 MR. CEJAS: Okay. 21 them to know that, and you did not tell them that, 21 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Do you see --22 22 correct? Thank you. 23 23 -- do you see that the last item Α. We did not use those words, correct. 24 24 Q. Not just those words -under -- on the summary page says: Since removal 25 We didn't make that -of the probation in April and July 2022, CAP and Page 242 Page 244 1 -- any other -- are there any words 1 CLIA conducted regular inspections and found zero deficiencies? 2 that would tell customers that CAP investigated the 2 A. CLIA found -- CLIA found zero complaint about false positives and found that it 3 3 was not true, you didn't use -deficiencies in our inspection. 4 5 5 Q. You said CAP and CLIA found zero --A. I don't agree with that. 6 conducted regular inspections and found zero -- those exact words or any words? 6 7 deficiencies. That's what you said, correct? 7 Α. I don't agree with that. 8 Q. Point me to the words. 8 A. This is probably not worded the best. 9 9 CLIA did not find any deficiencies in their --Α. Okay. Show me the words. 10 Q. Because -- because CAP did find 10 Q. 11 It was --11 deficiencies, and if somebody read that to say CAP and CLIA conducted regular inspections and found 12 Show them to me. Point me --13 MR. CEJAS: You're asking. Let her 13 zero deficiencies, if somebody would read that as

14 -- let her answer.

17

18

15 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) I'm -- I'm --

16 don't read it. Point me to the words.

MR. CEJAS: Well, she's --

Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) What page --

19 MR. CEJAS: This is --

20 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) -- what page --

21 excuse me, what page are you looking at?

22 A. I was looking at all the points.

23 Okay. Point me to the words that you

24 believe tell a customers that CAP investigated

25 whether you have false positives and that it found

it states, that you're saying CAP conducted a 14

regular inspection and found zero deficiencies, 15

16 that was a lie, wasn't it?

17 A. The sentence is not written the best.

CLIA conducted a regular inspection and found zero 18 19 deficiencies.

20 Q. You have two verbs in this sentence.

21 This says: In April and July of 2022, CAP and

22 CLIA -- that's subject of the sentence, right? CAP

23 and CLIA, correct?

24 A. As I said, it's not a well-written

25 sentence --



Page Dominique Delagnes

July 09, 2024 Page 245 Q. Excuse me. CAP and CLIA is the it or is that just your recollection?

2 subject of the sentence, is it?

3 A. CAP and CLIA conducted regular 4 inspections --

5

Q. Excuse me --

6 A. Yes, yes. -- my question is: CAP and CLIA is

8 the subject of the sentence.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Okay. And there are two verbs that

11 go with CAP and CLIA. One is "conducted" and one

12 is "found." correct?

13 Α. Yes.

14 And CAP did conduct a regular

15 inspection. That was the one you referred to in

16 April of -- of 2022, correct?

17 A. Yes.

Q. And it is false that CAP found zero 18

19 deficiencies, wasn't it?

20 A. CAP found deficiencies, yes.

21 How much care do you put into what

22 you tell customers? You know -- you're a literate

23 person. Did you review this when it -- before it

24 went out?

25 I don't think that I did. I hate to

2 A. I don't know for sure. I'd have to

3 go back and look.

Q. If it weren't Mr. Herzog, who --

5 what -- would Mr. Herzog have approved this going

6 out?

4

8

11

12

15

7 A. I don't know. Yes.

He would have, but you didn't see it?

9 I don't -- I don't recall.

10 You may have seen it? Q.

I may have seen it.

And let it go out saying that CAP

13 conducted a regular inspection in April 2022 and

found zero deficiencies; is that right? 14

As I said, I don't recall whether I

16 saw this beforehand or not.

17 Have you been counting up all of the false statements that we've gone over in the last 18

19 two days that Averhealth has made to customers, to

20 judges, to others?

21 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form.

22 Overbroad.

23 (BY MR. CORNFELD) I mean, are you Q.

24 shocked by the number of false statements

25 Averhealth has made?

Page 248

Page 247

Page 246 say this, but I'm pretty sure Jason Herzog wrote

this. I -- I don't believe that I did review it. 2

3 Q. So if this is -- if the jury were to

find that this was just an out-and-out lie when you

told customers that CAP had zero deficiencies, it

would be Jason Herzog who was the one who told that 6

7 lie?

8 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form.

9 Argumentative, assumes facts not in evidence.

10 Go ahead, if you know.

11 Calls for speculation, too.

12 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't know.

13 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You -- but you

14 believe that Mr. Herzog made that statement and the

jury can conclude whether that was a lie or not, 15

16 correct?

17 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form.

Again, it calls for a legal conclusion, calls for

19 speculation --

20 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go ahead.

21 MR. CEJAS: -- what a jury's going to

22 do or not.

23 (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go ahead.

24 I don't know. Α.

25 Do you know whether Mr. Herzog wrote 1 We've not made false statements.

2 This was a false statement.

3 It was a poorly written sentence.

4 Q. It was a false statement. It said

that -- it says -- it may have been -- you may

6 consider it poorly written, and I would agree that

that false positive is poorly written, but it says

that CAP conducted a regular inspection and found

9 zero deficiencies. And that simply wasn't true.

10 So my -- my question is: Are you

11 shocked by the number of times we've gone over

statements that Averhealth has made -- and we're

13 not going to go over them again, it's all in the

14 record -- but as we've gone over them, are you

really -- as the CEO of this company, are you just

16 simply shocked by the number of times this has

17 happened?

18

21

25

MR. CEJAS: Object to the form.

19 Argumentative, assumes facts not in evidence, lacks

20 foundation.

Go ahead.

22 THE WITNESS: I don't believe there's

23 a significant amount of false statements that

24 Averhealth has made.

(BY MR. CORNFELD) I'm sure as CEO,



Page: 63 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 249 Page 251 you've got to say that. Assumes facts not in evidence, incomplete 2 MR. CEJAS: Objection. Move to hypothetical, and argumentative. 3 strike. 3 Subject to that, go ahead. 4 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) That -- that 4 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go ahead. 5 would -- if you agreed that Averhealth's been lying 5 As I've stated previously, we -- we weren't making tremendous amount of false to the public for years about its testing 6 7 practices --7 statements --8 MR. CORNFELD: Rick --8 That's not my question. 9 (BY MR. CORNFELD) -- and you, as 9 A. I understand that that's --10 CEO --10 Q. I think you answered my question 11 MR. CEJAS: -- this is before you heard the full question. I just want it 11 inappropriate --12 on the record is: You answered that you don't know 12 13 MR. CORNFELD: Excuse me. 13 what would be a fireable offense because you don't 14 control your employment. MR. CEJAS: Rick, Rick, this is not 14 15 appropriate. This is commentary right now --15 When you understand that I was asking 16 MR. CORNFELD: It's a question. It's you if you were to state under oath that you were 16 17 a question. 17 shocked at the number of false statements 18 MR. CEJAS: There was not a question, Averhealth has made to the public, to judges, to 19 so rephrase the question, please. 19 regulators, to customers, would that be a firing 20 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) As the CEO, would 20 offense? And you said I don't know because I don't 21 that be a firing offense if you were to sit here 21 control my employment; is that right? 22 22 after hearing the number of false statements and MR. CEJAS: Object to the form. 23 23 say that you were surprised at the number of times Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go ahead. 24 24 Averhealth has lied to the public? MR. CEJAS: Assumes facts not in 25 I don't agree that there's been a 25 evidence, misstates her prior testimony. Page 250 Page 252 numerous number of times that Averhealth has agreed 1 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go ahead. 2 [sic] to the public. 2 MR. CEJAS: Compound question, lacks 3 Q. No. I -- I know as the president of 3 foundation, argumentative. the company, that's something that you're going to 4 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go ahead. say. My question is: If you -- if you were to say 5 MR. CEJAS: Go ahead. THE WITNESS: What I said was I don't that you were surprised, would that be a firing 6 6 7 offense? 7 control my employment. 8 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form. 8 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Who at Averhealth

That's highly argumentative. 10 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go ahead.

13 offense? 14

MR. CEJAS: Go ahead.

Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) If you admitted 15

THE WITNESS: Is what a fireable

that Averhealth had made many --

16 A. I don't know. I -- I -- I don't

17 control my employment.

Just so I have the question clear. 18

19 Uh-huh. Δ.

If you said that you were just 20

shocked by the number of times Averhealth has made 21

22 false statements to the public, to customers, to

23 judges, to -- to agencies, would that be a firing

offense? 24

9

11

12

25 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form. 9 would have the authority to discipline you?

10 It would not be Averhealth.

11 Who would have the authority to

discipline you if they thought you did something 12

13 wrong? Who would have the authority to fire you if

14 they thought you committed a firing offense?

15 It would be somebody from Five Arrows 16 Capital Partners.

17 Q. The -- the investment firm that owns

Averhealth? 18

19 Α. Correct.

20 Have the statements that we've seen 21 in this deposition been called to the attention of

22 Five Arrows?

25

23 MR. CEJAS: I'm going to object to

24 the form of the question.

(BY MR. CORNFELD) Go ahead.



Page: 64 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 253 MR. CEJAS: Go ahead. 1 And then there's a sentence that's 2 THE WITNESS: Have which statements? 2 crossed out, and it says: The quantity and type of 3 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Any of them. Any 3 deficiencies identified in association with 4 of the ones that -- where we talked about whether Averhealth Laboratory are consistent with industry 5 those were true statements made to the public, made 5 standards. 6 to customers, made to judges, made to regulators? 6 Do you see that? 7 MR. CEJAS: Same objection. 7 A. Yes. 8 Overbroad, assumes facts not in evidence. 8 Q. And then it says: Per Dominique. 9 Go ahead, if you understand it. 9 Can you explain that? 10 THE WITNESS: Has Five Arrows seen 10 A. I believe, if I recollect this 11 documentation, have seen correspondence with our 11 correctly, that I struck out that statement. 12 customers? Is that what you're asking? 12 Q. And why did you do that? 13 (BY MR. CORNFELD) Yes. 13 A. I don't recall. 14 Do you see that four -- two bullets A. Yes. 14 15 And has anybody discussed with them down, it says: Averhealth maintains its 15 16 whether those statements were true or false? accreditation today, and since the brief 16 17 A. I don't know. 17 probationary period -- and let's stop there. 18 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Mr. Cornfeld, 18 That probationary period was six 19 your... 19 months, correct? 20 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Has anybody at 20 A. Yes. Averhealth ever been disciplined for making a false 21 21 Why did you want to tell customers 22 statement to a customer, to a judge, to a -- to the 22 that it was a brief probationary period rather than 23 public, to regulators? tell them the true length of it of six months so 23 24 A. Not that I'm aware. 24 that they could decide for themselves whether six THE WITNESS: Before we look at your 25 months was brief or not? Page 254 Page 256 next document, can I get ice? Is that okay? Based on the complete time frame that 2 MR. CORNFELD: Sure. we had our accreditation, it was brief compared to 2 3 MR. PLEBAN: Give it to me. I'll do 3 the full accreditation period. it. I don't have a mic on. 4 Q. That wasn't my question. 5 THE WITNESS: Thanks. A. Okay. It was, you asked why we used 6 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Handing you what's the word "brief." 6 been marked as Exhibit 70 to this deposition, do Q. Wouldn't you want customers -- in the 7 you see that this is a document entitled: interest of transparency, wouldn't you want to tell Averhealth Customer Communication Response to Vice customers that the probationary period was six News Article that bears the Bates 4115? Do you months and let customers decide whether that was 11 have that? 11 brief or not? 12 A. Yes. 12 A. We chose to use the word "brief." 13 Are you familiar with this document? 13 Q. I know, that's my question. But 14 Α. Yes. 14 wouldn't customers have the right to know exactly 15 What is this? how long it was so they can decide whether that was 15 16 brief?

16 A. This is an internal document that we

17 provided to our employees and -- when there was

questions from customers about the Vice news

19 article.

20 Q. To provide talking points for them?

21 Α. Yes.

22 And if you look at the second bullet,

23 it states: From time to time following inspections

or data audits, regulators identify deficiencies

intended to foster continuous improvement.

Α. It was our choice to use the word "brief."

19 I understand that.

Α. 20 I know you understand that.

21 That's --

17

18

22 But shouldn't -- but shouldn't

23 customers have the right to make the decision

24 themselves whether it was brief?

25 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form. It's



July 09, 2024

Page: 65 of 111 Page Dominigue Delagnes Page 257 Page 259 argumentative. Hand -- you've been handed what's 1 2 THE WITNESS: If the customer had been marked as Exhibit 71. Is this the annual asked us a time frame, we would have shared that management review that she sent you in March 21, 3 with them. In this letter, we chose the word 4 2023? 5 "brief." 5 A. Yes. 6 6 Q. And for the record, it bears the Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Okay. And -- and then you go on in this sentence to say that: Bates number on the first page of 87183. Averhealth has successfully completed several 8 Three paragraphs down, do you see inspections by both CAP and CLIA with zero that she states: The CAP inspection was conducted 9 10 deficiencies. 10 on April 11th, 2022? 11 Do you see that? 11 A. Yes. 12 A. I do. 12 And -- and then she says: All Q. 13 Q. Is that another poorly written 13 deficiencies were satisfactorily remediated. 14 sentence that says that -- falsely, that CAP found 14 Correct? 15 zero deficiencies in April of 2022? 15 A. Yes. 16 Α. I believe it's the same sentence. 16 Q. And then she says what the 17 Q. It's not the same sentence. 17 remediation measures included, and she's got five 18 Okay. bullet points of remediation measures to remedy all Α. 18 19 Q. I mean, we can look at it, if you 19 of the deficiencies, correct? 20 want, but --20 A. Yes. 21 A. You're right, it is not. 21 So this confirms your understanding 22 All right. This even more clearly 22 that there were deficiencies in CAP's inspection states that CAP found zero deficiencies, doesn't 23 23 review in April of '22, doesn't it? 24 it? 24 MR. CEJAS: Object to form. Assumes 25 A. It does. facts not in evidence. We haven't seen the actual Page 258 Page 260

2 Can we look at the inspection report

3 from this time frame from CAP?

I'll tell you what we can look at. 4

Q. And that's false, isn't it?

5 From 2022?

6 Look at what Dr. Glinn told you about

7 it.

1

8 THE WITNESS: Nick, can we find the actual inspection report? 9

10 MR. CEJAS: We can.

11 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) I can show you

that, too, but first let me show you what Dr. Glinn 12

13 told you about it.

14 A. I just would like to look at the 15 inspection report from 2022.

MR. CEJAS: Here's the 2021 one. 16

17 Well. I'll find 2022.

Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Does Dr. Glinn 18

19 give you annual management reviews?

20 Α. Yes.

21 Q. What are the annual management

22 reviews?

23 It's part of the requirement for her

to provide information to me as far as what's 24

25 happened in the laboratory in the previous year.

report. 1

> 2 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go ahead.

3 Can I see the report? I'd like to

see the actual --4

5 First -- first, do you think

Dr. Glinn was making this up when --6

7 I don't.

8 -- when she said -- when she referred

to deficiencies? You'll accept that there were 9

deficiencies, won't you? 10

11 MR. CEJAS: Same objection.

12 THE WITNESS: I would like to see the

13 report.

14 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Excuse me. This

is the document. I am asking you about what

16 Dr. Glinn told you, and you don't -- you have no

17 reason to believe that she was lying to you when

she referred to all deficiencies and said you had

to undergo six different measures in order to 19

20 remediate them. She wasn't telling you a fib when

21 she said that, was she?

22 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form.

23 Assumes facts not in evidence. She answered your

24 question, said --

25 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go ahead.



Page: 66 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 261 Page 263 MR. CEJAS: -- she didn't look at it. 1 found in April of 2022 --2 (BY MR. CORNFELD) Go ahead. 2 MR. CEJAS: Object --3 3 Α. May I please --Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) -- correct? 4 Q. No. You can look at this exhibit, 4 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form. 5 which I am asking you about. 5 A. Okay. What's your question? 6 vague. 6 7 7 Dr. Glinn referred to all

deficiencies as we talked. Do you think she was 9 making that up?

10 Α. No.

8

11 Q. She was telling the truth to you,

wasn't she? 12

13 Α. Yes.

14 Q. There were deficiencies, you knew

that before you ever even saw this annual 15

16 management review.

17 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form.

18 Assumes facts not in evidence.

19 Go ahead, if you know.

20 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) You knew that,

21 didn't you?

22 Α. Yes.

23 Q. Okay. I don't think it's necessary

24 to look at the report. I will tell you this, it

25 isn't necessary. I'm sure you can go back and look Argumentative, assumes facts not in evidence, it's

If you can answer it, go ahead.

8 THE WITNESS: I don't understand the 9 question.

10 (BY MR. CORNFELD) I -- I'm asking Q. 11 you to assume that when you go look at that CAP report, that you'll find that it has several pages

13 of deficiencies.

14 Α. Okay. You're asking me to assume 15 that.

16 And that would confirm what you 17 understood before we even got into that topic this afternoon, that CAP found deficiencies in

19 Averhealth in its April 2022 inspection, correct?

20 A. If -- if there's deficiencies, then I 21 will find them, yes.

22 MR. CEJAS: April 11, 2022.

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

24 (BY MR. CORNFELD) Did you ever tell 25 any customer that -- and by "you," I mean did

Page 262

23

12

23

24

at it, and if you find that there are no

deficiencies in the -- in that report, you can tell

3 Mr. Cejas and he can take whatever judicial action

he thinks is appropriate to sanction me in front of

5 the Court.

6 On the other hand, if you find that there were, in fact, several pages of deficiencies

in that report, that will confirm what you already

understood before I ever showed you the annual

10 management review, that there were deficiencies,

11 correct?

15

20

12 MR. CEJAS: I'll object to the form.

13 It's argumentative. You just made a decision not

14 to show her. That's fine, that's your decision --

MR. CORNFELD: No, I can --

16 MR. CEJAS: -- but you can't use that

17 as a sword and a shield. It's one or the other.

MR. CORNFELD: Oh, no, no, I can ask 18

19 her this hypothetical.

MR. CEJAS: No, it's argumentative.

21 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) If you -- if you

22 find when you look at the actual report that there

23 were several pages of deficiencies, that would

24 confirm your understanding before we even got into

25 this topic that there were deficiencies that CAP

Page 264 Averhealth ever tell any customer in any of its

communications regarding the -- the CAP probation

and the reasons for lifting the probation, that 3

Averhealth was inspected for whether there were

false positives and CAP found that there were no

6 false positives?

7 Α. You asked me that earlier in that one document. 8

9 Q. About the one document. I'm asking you, because I haven't seen it. I'm asking you 10 11 did --

I don't believe so, no. Α.

13 All right. I just have a few

14 follow-up things from the last couple of days.

15 When -- you told us that you thought it was in 2018 that Averhealth brought its testing 16 17 in-house, I think it was hair testing, and that's

when you changed the -- the cutoff. 18

19 I said I didn't know. I made a -- I 20 made a -- I said I would follow up with an exact 21 date.

22 Okay. My question --

I don't remember the date.

Okay. My question isn't -- doesn't

have anything to do with the date.



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 67 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 265 Page 267 Averhealth's tests are accurate. Tell me all the Okay. 2 2 Q. Why did Averhealth bring its testing reasons why you believe that. 3 3 A. I believe that our test results are in-house? 4 Before that, what testing did accurate because we have test processes in place that are scientifically valid and forensically 5 Averhealth bring in-house? 5 defensible, and that through the testing processes, A. Hair -- our hair testing. 6 6 7 Why did you do that? that our employees follow the SOPs appropriately. 8 So we could provide test results 8 By the "testing processes," you're under one umbrella and have the ability to -- it's referring to the SOPs? 9 9 10 A. Yes. 10 easier for processing. 11 Q. You said yesterday, and I think it 11 Q. Which SOPs? 12 All of the SOPs. 12 was at the beginning of the deposition, that you had employees who had been retrained, suggesting 13 All right. Does that complete your that they might have been doing things wrong. Who 14 answer on the reasons why you believe the tests are 14 15 -- who are those employees that were retrained 15 accurate? 16 because they needed to be instructed on how to do 16 THE WITNESS: Can you read back my 17 things properly? 17 answer? 18 (The preceding answer was read back.) 18 I'd have to go back and look at 19 records. I can't list off -- them -- I don't know 19 THE WITNESS: There's -- there's a them off the top of my head. 20 lot more to that. Right? We know that through 20 each step, that we handle specimens appropriately. 21 Do you know any of them? 21 22 22 Our employees at the laboratory handle one sample A. I -- not off the top of my head. 23 What are the -- what are those 23 at a time. We have quality control specimens and 24 24 quality control procedures that allow us to be able records called, so we can search for them? to ensure that the specimens are accurate. 25 They -- it would be -- it could be a Page 266 Page 268 document that says Employee Performance. 1 Q. (BY MR. CORNFELD) Anything else? 2 We follow appropriate chain of 2 Would they have any other name? 3 A. I can follow up with the names of 3 custody guidelines throughout the entire testing them. 4 process 4 5 Okay. You --5 There's many others. I mean, it's Q. hard for me to sit here -- I mean, those are the 6 I can follow up with the names of 6 what the document would be. 7 broad major categories. 7

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. Is that what you're asking?

10 Q. Yeah. I mean, you don't --

11 A. Okay.

12 Q. -- have to tell us the specific ones,

13 if you tell us what that documents are called --

14 A. Sure.

15 Q. -- so we can search for them, if

16 you can tell Mr. Cejas --

17 A. Absolutely.

18 Q. -- so he can tell us.

19 A. I can do that.

Q. All right.

21 A. Typically -- I believe it's called

22 Employee Corrective Action. There's a -- there's a

23 name at the top of the form.

Q. All right. You've said several times

25 over the past few days that you believe

8 Q. All right. Those are the ones that

9 come to mind right now?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. All right. And all of those -- I

12 think every one of those, you mentioned would be

13 tied to following the SOPs; is that right?

14 A. Sure. I mean, chain of custody, I

15 guess it -- yes. I mean, it's also the ability to

16 track samples to chain of custodies a little bit,

17 of maybe not only following SOPs, but the ability

18 to track specimens.

19 Q. And -- and -- and if an employee

20 doesn't do all of the things that you mentioned,

21 then that would jeopardize whether the tests are

22 accurate, correct?

A. Depends upon what happens.

Q. It could jeopardize whether the tests

25 are accurate, correct?



23

Page: 68 of 111 Page Dominique Delagnes July 09, 2024 Page 269 Page 271 A. It's not always going to, but there completed the testing with the appropriate QCs, and 2 are certain things that an employee did that could, 2 re-reported the test results. 3 3 Q. Was it -- was the specimen tested ves. 4 Q. Who at Five Arrows is in charge of again or was it just --5 5 The specimen was tested a second Averhealth? A. 6 6 A. Who at Five Arrows is in charge of time, yes. 7 Averhealth? 7 Q. The same specimen? 8 Q. Yes. 8 A. Yes. Who's the -- the -- I guess the --9 So it wasn't destroyed when it was 9 10 the partner, Ari -- I'm going to spell his last 10 tested the first time? 11 name incorrectly. 11 A. So we maintain for a -- a period of 12 time the actual, like, aliquot in the aliquot vile. Q. Do the best you can. 12 13 So that can get pulled and reinjected when it's

13 A. It's Benacerraf. B-E-N -- do I have my phone in here? I don't. 14

15 MR. CEJAS: Just do the best you can.

16 THE WITNESS: B-E-N-N-E-C-E-R-I-F 17 [sic], I believe.

(BY MR. CORNFELD) First name? 18

19 Ari, A-R-I.

20 And where is he? Q.

21 In New York City.

22 Is he an employee of Five -- oh, he's

23 a partner of Five Arrows?

24 Α. Uh-huh.

25 I guess Five Arrows is a partnership?

14 liquefied.

15 Q. When you say a short time, that's not

16 the -- the two years that's set forth in the

17 contract or in the report?

18 A. The one year that's set forth in

19 contract? No, it's -- no, it's the individual specimen, it's -- that at some point in time is 20

going to completely evaporate, right, so it doesn't 21

22 have a life cycle forever.

23 Okay. And how were -- how was it Q.

24 re-QC'd?

1

9

18

24

25

25 It went back into a new batch.

Page 270 1 Yes? A. I believe so. 2 3 All right. If -- can you look him up, and if you have the spelling wrong, would you 5 tell --

6 A. Absolutely. 7 -- Mr. Cejas?

8 Yes.

9 Ω Okay. Yesterday, we -- we talked

about the fact that there were -- about Mrs. 10

11 Foulger, that there were two reports.

Uh-huh. 12

13 Yes?

Yes. 14 Α.

15 O. Okay.

16 Α. I apologize, yes.

17 You were going to check to see why

18 they -- why that was. Did you do that?

19 A. I did. So originally, it was

released prematurely, so the specimen never should 20

21 have reported. It was pulled back. And so then

22 the test results were updated. So when it was

23 originally released, the certifying scientist

released the result, realized that we didn't have

valid QCs with all of them, pulled the result back,

Page 272 So -- and that would have new QCs? Q.

2 Correct. Α.

3 Q. Is a historical QC used?

4 I don't believe so, no. Α.

5 It's -- okay.

6 Have you spoken to any of the

7 plaintiffs in this case?

8 Α. No.

> Q. Do you know anybody who has?

10 Besides what you had already set Α.

forth? 11

12 Q. Yeah, right.

13 Α. No.

14 MR. CORNFELD: Okay. Thank you so

much. That's all the questions I have today. 15

16 MR. CEJAS: I have a few questions.

17 THE WITNESS: Yes.

EXAMINATION

19 QUESTIONS BY MR. CEJAS:

20 Q. I'll start by handing you what was previously marked Exhibit 48. In fact, I think 21

22 you've got it, if you can find Exhibit 48.

23 Α. Sure.

> Q. As well as Exhibit 50, please.

They're all out of order.



Page: 69 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page Dominique Delagnes Page 273 Page 275 1 MR. CORNFELD: What are these? Q. And even with what CAP found to be 2 MR. CEJAS: 48 is the January 29. substantiated, is your testimony -- do you still 3 '21, letter from CAP to Dr. Glinn. And then Exhibit 50 is the transcript from Michigan. 4 transcript of -- of Exhibit 50? 4 5 MR. CORNFELD: You said 49 and 50? 5 A. Yes. THE WITNESS: 48. 6 Q. All right. You were also asked there 6 7 MR. CEJAS: 48.

8 MR. CORNFELD: 48? That was the 9 January?

10 MR. CEJAS: 29, January 29.

11 Q. (BY MR. CEJAS) All right.

12 Ms. Delagnes, do you have Exhibits 48 and 50 in

13 front you?

14 A. I do.

15 Q. All right. And you were asked a

16 number of questions for quite a long time about the

17 four complaints that were found and substantiated,

which are set forth in 48, including that second 18

19 line item, failure to follow procedures as written.

20 Do you remember that testimony?

21 A. I do.

22 Q. All right. And then you were shown

23 Exhibit 50, which was your sworn testimony in the

24 state of Michigan on February 5th, 2021.

25 And specifically, you were asked stand behind your testimony here on page 12 of your

at the end, and I apologize, this is electronic,

but I do have the April 2022 lab report, which for

the record --9

10 MR. CORNFELD: You mean the

inspection? 11

12 MR. CEJAS: Inspection report.

13 Sorry.

14 For the record, it's AH0019489.

15 MR. CORNFELD: Can you hang on just a 16 moment? Go ahead.

Q. (BY MR. CEJAS) All right. Have you 17

had a chance to review that document now that it's

19 sitting in front of you?

20 Yes. Α.

21 And you were asking earlier to see

22 this, now you've had a chance to read it, correct?

23 A. Yes.

24 All right. And you'll see as you

25 flip through it, the first several pages list no

Page 276

Page 274 several questions about testimony on page 12. If

you could please flip to page 12 for me. 2

A. Yes.

3

4 And you were asked about one

particular sentence, or question one particular

6 sentence, but can you tell me -- look at the

context of -- of what's here on page 12. What was 7

the point you were attempting to make in your 8

9 testimony on page 12?

10 That our employees do follow our 11 standard operating procedures on a consistent

12 basis.

13 And is that, in fact, found on -- on

14 lines 15 through 16?

Yes. 15 Α.

16 Okay. There was a sentence right

17 before it that you were asked about. Could you

tell us what you meant by that particular sentence 18

19 from lines 14 through 15?

20 A. It was not well stated, where I said

that, and really what I intended to state, which 21 22 I -- which was stated much better in the second

23 sentence, is that our employees do follow our

standing operating procedures on a consistent 25 basis.

deficiencies. Is that accurate?

Yes. 2 Α.

6

12

18

25

3 Q. Okay. And then if we get to 19493,

there are some things written there in terms of

deficiencies. Is that accurate?

They're recommendations.

Okay. And what were those 7

8 recommendations that were made?

9 Δ The one -- 19493?

Correct. 10 Q.

11 Α. Okay.

And just generally, what -- what

13 essentially is CAP saying here?

14 A. Talking about adding a sentence to a

15 chemical hygiene plan, add requirements to notify

CAP of the laboratory subject to investigation. So 16

17 it's about adding verbiage into our SOPs.

Q. All right.

MR. CORNFELD: I'm sorry, what did 19

20 you say?

21 THE WITNESS: Adding verbiage into 22 our standing operating procedures.

23 (BY MR. CEJAS) And if we scroll to

the next page, can you tell us what's listed there? 24

Reagent lot acceptance criteria is



Pagel Dominique Delagnes

2

3

9

14

15

17

20

21

July 09, 2024

Page 279

Page 280

Page 277 not included in the SOP, and that was corrected on

2 site. So that's adding verbiage into our SOP.

Q. Okay. Please keep going.

4 A. Oral fluid and hair testing listed on

5 activity menu, testing currently is not performed

6 in accordance with -- so the -- the hair testing

7 was taken off of the activity menu and oral fluid I

8 believe was missing some drugs that we tested. So

9 we needed to update our activity menu on CAP's

10 website.

3

11 Q. Okay. Can you keep going down for me

12 onto the next page?

13 A. Written procedure for chain of

14 custody did not mention temporary storage location

15 for aliquots.

16 Q. All right. So is that another thing

17 in terms of documentation that would be updated?

18 A. Yes. And then control acceptance

19 rejection criteria is not clearly described in the

20 SOP.

21 Q. Okay.

22 A. And then record storage is not

23 segregated from the main facility, access not

24 secured beyond overall security of the facility.

25 So actually, our records storage was

1 standing behind, you said --

A. Yes.

Q. -- I think you said generally --

4 A. Yes, I stand behind test results.

5 MR. CORNFELD: Object. Leading.

6 Q. (BY MR. CEJAS) So let me rephrase

7 that. You recall testimony earlier about standing

8 behind test results. Is that accurate?

A. Yes.

10 Q. Okay. And is it your understanding

11 in this case that there are eight individuals who

12 have filed a claim against Averhealth?

13 MR. CORNFELD: Object. Leading.

Q. (BY MR. CEJAS) To your

understanding, how many individuals have a filed a

16 lawsuit in this case against Averhealth?

A. Eight.

A. Yes.

18 Q. And have the tests conducted on those19 eight individuals been reviewed after this lawsuit

was filed?

22 Q. Okay. And was there a determination

23 made as to whether the reports on those tests for

24 those eight individuals were accurate?

25 MR. CORNFELD: Object. Leading.

Page 278

secured. We didn't provide accurate information to

the inspector, like somebody didn't show them, wekeep our records storage locked and it says frozen

4 storage of primary specimen bottle not secured

5 beyond the overall security.

6 Q. And are those all the deficiencies

7 from the April 11, 2022, inspection?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Are any of those deficiencies from

10 April 11, 2022, related to the accuracy of

11 interpretation of any drug tests?

12 A. No.

13 Q. All right. You can set that aside.

14 A. Okay.

15 Q. You were also asked several questions

16 about standing behind reports issued by Averhealth.

17 Do you remember that testimony from earlier?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And I think you mentioned at some

20 point you would need to review each one

21 individually. Is that an accurate summary of what

22 you said earlier?

23 A. That I specifically need to review

24 each one?

25 Q. Well, when you were asked about

THE WITNESS: Yes.

2 Q. (BY MR. CEJAS) What was the --

3 strike that.

4 What was the determination made with

5 respect to the accuracy of the tests performed on

6 the eight plaintiffs in this case?

7 A. All of the test results have been

8 reviewed and have been found to be accurate.

9 Q. Does Averhealth stand behind the

10 accuracy and reliability of those tests?

11 A. Yes.

12 MR. CEJAS: Those are all the

13 questions I have. Thank you.

14 FURTHER EXAMINATION

15 QUESTIONS BY MR. CORNFELD:

16 Q. Yeah, I think I went over the review

17 that you say was made of the plaintiffs' tests

18 after the lawsuit was filed. And I asked you who

19 did that review, and I don't remember exactly what

20 you told me, but you gave me some names of people,

21 correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And I asked you what documents there

24 were. What documents are there that reflect that

25 review? I think you said they just did the review,



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 71 of 111 Page Dominique Delagnes July 09, 2024 Page 281 Page 283 It's not something that I requested. they didn't write it down, correct? 1 2 2 You asked if there was a document Q. I understand. Why not? 3 that stated that they looked at them, yes. 3 Okay. I did not --A. 4 There is a document that says that? 4 Q. Is there any reason? No, you asked me if there was. 5 5 -- think to do it. Δ 6 And you told me that there wasn't? 6 Q. You didn't think that maybe we'd want 7 Α. Correct. to see what the -- what the basis was so we could They're just in their heads, they 8 see whether they did an adequate review, and came looked at it and said, oh, yeah these are correct. to the proper conclusions, and knew why -- what the 9 9 10 No, we've had conversations about --

14

23

11 as they've compiled them together, as they reviewed 11 12

12 them on the accuracy of those test results. So they've each been looked at and have been put

together. And the person who pulled the

documentation reviewed the data. And as they

16 dropped it into the files for us to combine it all

17 had indicated that, you know, had moved them in

18 there and had indicated that they're accurate.

19 Is there any reason why you didn't

20 have them write down what they did and the basis of

their conclusion so we could review it and we could 21

22 have an expert witness review it and see whether

23 that expert agrees that they did an adequate

24 review?

1

11

25 A. By providing the documentation, that 10 basis was?

A. By providing --

MR. CEJAS: Object to the form.

13 Argumentative and asked and answered.

But go ahead.

15 THE WITNESS: By providing the 16 litigation packages to you, it gave you the 17 information that you need to accurately review the accuracy of the test results. 18

19 (BY MR. CORNFELD) I'm not talking about reviewing the accuracy of the test results. 20

21 We're going to do that.

22 Okay.

Q. I shouldn't say -- it's in the

24 future. That's going to be presented. My question

is: Reviewing your people, what your people did,

Page 284

Page 282 gives you what your experts need --

2 No, that's not my question. Yes, our 3 experts can review the documentation you provided.

4 Α. Uh-huh.

5 I'm talking about the review that you 6 say your personnel did of these tests when they

concluded that the tests were done correctly. Is 7

8 there any reason why you didn't have them write

9 those -- the basis of that review down, what they

10 reviewed, and why they came to their conclusions?

Can you rephrase the question?

12 When -- when your personnel reviewed

13 the test results -- I think there were 114 of the

14 plaintiffs in this case -- and concluded, as you

15 have stated, that those tests were done properly,

16 is there any reason why you didn't have them write

17 down what they reviewed and the basis of their

18 conclusion?

19 The effort was to compile all the 20 data to put the litigation packages together.

21 Q. Well, that you -- that you did, but

22 you're now saying they did something more. They

23 reviewed the data and came to the conclusion that

24 the tests were properly done. My question is: Why

25 didn't you have them write that down? to see whether they did an adequate review and came

to the proper conclusions, why -- why didn't you 2

have them write that down so we could look at it 3

4 and see what that was?

5 MR. CEJAS: Object to the form.

6 Argumentative, asked and answered.

Go ahead. 7

THE WITNESS: I didn't think to do

it. I believe that the -- that the litigation

10 packages themselves spoke to the accuracy of the

test results because that gave you all the data

12 that you needed.

13 (BY MR. CORNFELD) Did anybody

14 exchange e-mails about it?

A. I don't -- I don't believe so. I'd 15

have to look. 16

17 Ω Or any --

18 We can look and -- we'll look and see

if there are any e-mails and we'll produce them if 19

20 we have them.

21 Q. Or -- or chats?

22 A. Yeah, we will look and we will 23 produce any that -- that there are.

24 Okay. We're going to need them

pretty quickly because those should be produced



Page: 72 of 111 July 09, 2024 Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24

	rayeid #: 430	<u>U</u>	, ,
1	Page 285 already, if they exist.	1	Page 287 Lexitas Legal
2	A. Okay.	2	711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101
3	Q. And our our expert deadline is		Phone 314/644-2191
4	coming up pretty quickly, so I would ask that	3 4	
5	you if you have them, you produce them right	5	July 22, 2024
6	away.	6	Mr. Nicholas P. Cejas ARMSTRONG TEASDALE, LLP
7	That's all the questions I have.	7	7700 Forsyth Boulevard, Suite 1800
8	MR. CEJAS: All right. We will read	8	St. Louis, Missouri 63105
9	and sign.	9	IN RE: Katarzyna Foulger, et al. v. Avertest, LLC
10	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 4:46.		d/b/a Averhealth
11	We are off the record.	10 11	Dear Mr. Cejas:
	we are on the record.	12	Please find enclosed your copy of the deposition of
12		13	Dominique Delagnes taken on July 9, 2024, in the above-referenced case. Also enclosed is the
13			original signature page and errata sheets.
14		14	Please have the witness read your copy of the
15		15	transcript, indicate any changes and/or corrections
16		1.0	desired on the errata sheets, and sign the
17		16 17	signature page before a notary public. Please return the errata sheets and notarized
18			signature page to Lexitas Legal, ATTN: Production
19		18	Department, 711 N. 11th Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63101 within 30 days of receipt of this letter.
20		19	
21		20	Sincerely,
22		21	Tammie A. Heet, RPR, CSR, CCR
23		22	Enclosures cc: Mr. Richard Cornfeld
24		23	Lexitas Legal Production
25		24 25	
l .		20	
1	Page 286	1	Page 288
1 2		1	
		1 2	STATE OF)
2	NOTARIAL CERTIFICATE		STATE OF)
2	NOTARIAL CERTIFICATE I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional	2	STATE OF)
2 3 4	NOTARIAL CERTIFICATE I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the	2	STATE OF
2 3 4 5	NOTARIAL CERTIFICATE I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for	2 3 4	STATE OF) CITY OF) I, DOMINIQUE DELAGNES, do hereby certify:
2 3 4 5	NOTARIAL CERTIFICATE I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned	2 3 4 5 6	STATE OF) CITY OF) I, DOMINIQUE DELAGNES, do hereby certify: That I have read the foregoing deposition; That I have made such changes in form and/or substance to the within deposition as might be
2 3 4 5 6	NOTARIAL CERTIFICATE I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CITY OF) I, DOMINIQUE DELAGNES, do hereby certify: That I have read the foregoing deposition; That I have made such changes in form and/or substance to the within deposition as might be necessary to render the same true and correct;
2 3 4 5 6 7	NOTARIAL CERTIFICATE I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	NOTARIAL CERTIFICATE I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	NOTARIAL CERTIFICATE I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	NOTARIAL CERTIFICATE I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	NOTARIAL CERTIFICATE I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CITY OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I, Tammie A. Heet, Registered Professional Reporter, certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, and Certified Court Reporter for the state of Missouri and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the States of Missouri and Illinois, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CITY OF

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL

c. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Pagel Dominique Delagnes Doc. #: 106-29 Page: 73 of 111 July 09, 2024 Page 289 DOMINIQUE DELAGNES NAME OF DEPONENT 2 DEPOSITION CORRECTION SHEET 3 IN RE: Katarzyna Foulger, et al. v. Avertest, LLC d/b/a Averhealth 5 Reported by: TAH Upon reading the deposition and before subscribing thereto, the deponent indicated the following changes should be made: Page Line Should Read: Reason assigned for change: 9 Page Line Should Read: 10 Reason assigned for change: 11 12 Page Line Should Read: Reason assigned for change: 13 14 Page Line Should Read: Reason assigned for change: 15 16 Page Line Should Read: Reason assigned for change: 18 Page Line Should Read: Reason assigned for change: 19 20 Page Line Should Read: Reason assigned for change: 21 Page Line Should Read: 22 Reason assigned for change: 2.3 25 SIGNATURE OF DEPONENT



Exhibits

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 45 2:13 9:19 10:17 13:1 27:15 28:6

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 46 2:14 33:3

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 47 2:15 36:15 37:17 38:18 44:17 55:5

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 48 2:16 61:7,19 62:9 71:9 272:21,22

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 49 2:17 66:9

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 50 2:18 76:1 272:24 273:4,23 275:4

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 51 2:19 91:19

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 52 2:20 94:16 95:9 97:11

94:16 95:9 97:1 98:16

98:16

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 53 2:21 103:22

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 54 2:22 104:14 113:9

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 55 2:24 110:4 113:9

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 56 2:25 124:19

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 57 3:3 150:16 152:6

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 58 3:4 174:21 180:21 181:19 184:20

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 59 3:5 175:9,24 177:6,7

182:2 183:6,9 184:2 185:24 186:11,24

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 60 3:6

189:21 190:17

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 61 3:7 189:23 191:16,21

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 62 3:8 194:25 198:22

200:2,6 231:16

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 63 3:9

200:15 202:2 209:3 210:20 212:23 213:4 214:14 215:9

218:25 219:1

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 64 3:10

24 EX 64 3:10 201:13,24 205:20 206:25 207:1,8, 13,14 208:13 209:24 211:13 217:14

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 65 3:11 219:9,12

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 66 3:12 225:21

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 67 3:13 226:19 228:20 229:9

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 68 3:14 230:3

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 69 3:15 234:19 236:6 243:9

168740 Delagnes, Dominique 07.09. 24 EX 70 3:16 254:7

168740 Delagnes, Dominique **07.09**. **24 EX 71** 3:17 259:2

\$

\$1.3 47:12 48:2,25 49:8

\$29 114:15

1

1 21:22 22:15 141:16 142:12

1.5 141:21

10 15:10 16:17 28:15 125:20 126:14 148:23 156:5 189:22 190:16

100 8:25 57:11

10219 221:8

10440 202:17 205:22

10:05 67:17

10:16 61:5

10:58 94:10

11 63:6,7 183:2 263:22 278:7,10

114 282:13

11:18 94:13

11:47 117:9

11th 10:5 259:10

12 60:22 83:13 96:23 145:21 274:1,2,7,9 275:3

12:40 117:13

12th 225:16



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 75 of 111

Dags Dominious Delagnes July 09, 2024Index: 13..31

case. 4.22-cv-00070-311	Pagel D 06. #. 100-29	BDelagnes	July 09, 2024Index: 1331
13 28:12 145:10	183:1 202:15	208:11,15,17	26 34:25 35:5
146:16 159:23	203:15,24 209:3	214:13 216:10	103:24
160:2 162:6 178:6	235:11	218:12 219:14,24	2651 175:12
179:23 186:7,14,	2.0 72:23	220:3 225:23	
19 195:1 216:9	20 21:4 57:16	226:24 228:21	26th 97:11 98:15
220:2 231:15 232:12,18		230:5 232:18 235:12,14 258:16	27 61:24
·	200 131:9	273:24	28 15:20 34:25
13th 16:5 124:23	2014 8:8 172:22		235:12,14
195:18 202:8 213:13 214:13	2016 166:12	2022 67:12 243:11,25 244:21	28th 150:18 202:6
225:8	2017 166:13	245:16 247:13	29 44:10,14 45:6
		257:15 258:5,15,	54:9 55:6,9 63:23
14 274:19	2018 166:14	17 259:10 263:1,	64:5 92:1 230:5
15 274:14,19	264:16	19,22 275:8	273:2,10
16 67:11 274:14	2019 38:5 93:6	278:7,10	2916 8:24
16940 200:21	166:14	2023 233:6,13	
	2020 9:23 10:5	234:1 259:4	29th 61:9
17 33:6 189:25 225:22	16:7 21:10,23	2024 6:9 8:4	2:03 184:12
	28:6,13 33:6 36:17 38:5 42:7	20th 133:8 219:14,	2:17 184:17
17088 20:23	44:4 56:9 63:7,16	24	
17089 21:21	94:20 96:23 100:1	21 91:21 104:16	3
17105 189:25	101:11 102:6,9	259:3 273:3	
1730 131:8	103:4 105:22		3 55:9 93:4 159:5
17th 36:24	111:24 166:15	21065 210:4	183:2,5 184:3 212:22
	180:24 231:12	21604 201:25	
18th 9:23 25:11	2021 44:20 45:7	21606 211:14	3/13 178:10,13,15
27:7,14 28:6 37:1, 2,3,4	54:8 55:1,8 61:9,	21607 216:16	3/13/21 175:11
	24 63:23 64:5 76:10 84:25 92:1	21629 217:14	185:22
19 94:20	94:21,22 95:20	218:8	3/21 178:7
19194 219:22	97:11 98:15,25	21674 57:2,19	3/7 178:7,13
19493 276:3,9	101:2 103:24	· ·	3/7/21 175:10
19th 95:20	104:16 105:25	21744 56:1	30 45:20 48:16
1:23 158:20	106:2,22 110:6,13 111:20 112:1	21748 56:11	77:22 81:17,18,22
	118:8 123:10	22 44:4 259:23	100:10,14,18,24
1:31 158:24	124:22,23 125:9	22nd 36:17 152:12	101:4,6,13,22
1st 24:19 25:24	133:5,8 150:18	23230 8:25	106:14,16 125:21
42:7 208:17	152:12 165:6,18,		198:2,23 208:2
	21 166:16,18,20	24 92:16 174:24	225:10
2	174:24 175:5,6 176:4 179:23	178:2 218:12	30(b)(6) 35:19
2 22:15,16 54:7	181:3 186:7	25 41:12 91:21	185:3
55:4,7 92:18	189:22,25 190:16	25th 226:24	30-day 225:17
141:21 182:3	195:1 202:6,9	228:21	31 24:17,18 25:24
	1		1



Filed: 08/08/24 Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29

Page: 76 of 111
July 09, 2024Index: 31st..acceptance Page Dominique Delagnes 42:1,3,4,8 **616225** 159:6 9 5 **31st** 208:17 **62** 194:25 198:22 200:2,6 231:16 **32404** 174:22 **5** 105:17 110:15 **9** 175:6 176:22 111:15 159:10.18 **63** 200:15 202:2 **97** 34:22 35:5 209:3 210:20 160:8,14 161:3 **32406** 184:24 **9:24** 36:8 212:23 213:4 196:20 197:3,18 187:9 214:14 215:9 198:22 215:8 **9:25** 36:12 **37207** 189:23 218:25 219:1 222:7 231:15 **9:44** 219:25 **39** 61:14 63:7 **50** 45:20 76:1 **64** 201:13,24 **9:58** 61:1 205:20.21 206:25 141:22 272:24 **3:24** 229:23 207:1,8,14 208:13 273:4,5,12,23 **9th** 6:9 124:22 **3:44** 230:1 209:24 211:13 275:4 125:9 133:5 217:14 166:20 **51** 91:19 4 **65** 219:9,12 **52** 94:16 95:9 Α **66** 225:21 97:11 98:16 **4** 44:19 45:7 54:8. 25 55:8 57:2 **67** 226:19 228:20 **53** 103:22 **A-R-I** 269:19 76:23,24,25 229:9 **54** 104:14 113:9 **a.m.** 6:10 36:8 159:15,19,21 **68** 230:3 61:1,5 67:17 160:4,13,16,17,19 **55** 9:4 110:4 113:9 94:10 219:25 162:5,6 214:12, **69** 234:19 236:6 **56** 124:19 16,17,18 236:9 243:9 **ABFT** 177:22 **57** 150:16 152:6 **40** 96:18,21,22 **ability** 44:1 132:18 **58** 174:21 180:13, 7 192:9 265:9 **4115** 254:10 21 181:19 184:20 268:15,17 **43819** 103:25 **7** 77:1 152:6 **59** 175:9,24 177:7 above-board **45** 9:19 10:17 **70** 254:7 180:16 182:2 116:5 13:1,7 27:15 28:6 183:6,9 184:2 **71** 259:2 abruptly 15:7 185:24 186:11,24 **46** 33:3 17:18 **78821** 66:10 **5th** 76:10 273:24 **47** 36:15 37:17 **absent** 204:8 7:06 25:24 38:18 44:17 55:5 absolutely 132:22 6 **48** 61:7,19 62:9 8 224:8 266:17 71:9 272:21,22 270:6 **6** 156:21 157:18 273:2,6,7,8,12,18 **8** 21:6,8 175:5 159:5 196:22 accept 40:7 48:24 **48954** 227:2 186:1 189:11 197:3,15 199:4 233:12 260:9 200:9 202:15 **49** 66:7,9 273:5 **80** 57:11,15 acceptability 214:18 4:22-CV-00878 **87183** 259:7 215:15 **6-MAM** 70:20 6:13 **8:44** 6:10 acceptable 43:14 **60** 189:21 190:17 **4:46** 285:10 71:22 93:18 8th 166:19 182:22 **61** 189:23 191:16, 21 acceptance 57:25 65:11 276:25



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 77 of 111 Page! Dominiques Delagnes July 09, 2024Index: accepted..ahead

	Pagel D off! 1 49 09	5Delagries July 09, 2	2024Index: acceptedanead
277:18	130:15 131:14	100:6 216:21	afternoon 220:19
accepted 52:24	140:10,23 152:4	additional 37:14	263:18
53:12 142:6	160:12 267:1,4,		2.0
55.12 142.0	15,25 268:22,25	44:5,9 93:21	age 7:9
access 277:23	276:1,5 278:1,21	179:4,18 182:4,18 184:4,5 190:17	agencies 250:23
accessioning	279:8,24 280:8	191:18 226:2	agree 34:3 48:13
182:16	281:18	191.16 220.2	60:5,10,15
102.10		address 8:14,15,	' '
accessions	accurately 143:4	16,19,22 36:1	129:19,21 188:16,
125:14 126:6,11	283:17		17,22 242:5,7
123.14 120.0,11		157:24 203:14	248:6 249:25
accommodate	acid 133:17	222:6 224:2,5	
40:7	a a km a vyla da a	232:17	agreed 6:1 48:23
40.7	acknowledge		50:22 249:5 250:1
accordance 277:6	232:23	addressed 103:3	
		addresses FF.O	agreeing 47:11
accreditation 9:21	acknowledged	addresses 55:9	48:1
36:19 61:10 62:14	233:17	210:22	
74:23,25 75:4			agreement 60:12
•	acknowledgment	addressing	201.00
83:22 195:2,3	191:5,13 192:2	232:10	agrees 281:23
196:6,23 200:17	Act 50:1	adequate 49:8	AH0019489
201:14 210:23	ACT 30.1	<u> </u>	275:14
211:2,4,22 221:4	acting 165:10	281:23 283:8	273.14
226:23 227:6	168:17 172:3	284:1	AH0032424
230:6 231:3	100.17 172.0	adaguataly 214:9	182:14
	action 10:19 11:23	adequately 214:8	102.14
234:21 235:15	71:23 93:7,8	215:1	ahead 27:24 29:20
255:16 256:2,3	149:4,5,10,23	adhere 214:19	31:19 33:1 48:6
24.00		adilete 214.19	49:5 58:7 59:2
accredited 74:22	150:6 210:13	adjustments	
96:1	262:3 266:22	212:19	60:1 75:9 80:14
accrediting 80:24	actions 38:4		82:17 86:24 89:17
_		administrative	90:4 91:16 97:24
88:1,3,6,8	72:18,20 190:21	20:17	100:5 103:11
accuracy 77:5	209:7 221:20		107:16 108:21
96:20 118:2,13,14	222:4 234:22	admit 22:10 23:19	109:25 113:4,16,
	235:8	admits 47:24	
119:8 121:7		aumits 47.24	22 115:24 116:11
123:12 128:9	activity 277:5,7,9	admitted 47:20	120:13 121:20
130:8,10 140:16	actual 258:9	250:14	122:3,21 123:4
278:10 280:5,10			125:4 127:16
281:12 283:18,20	259:25 260:4	advance 9:1	128:2,13 129:16
284:10	262:22 271:12	126:15	131:19 132:17
204.10	add 124:3 276:15		
accurate 11:3,15,	auu 124.3 270.13	advanced 62:5	133:25 136:8,10
19 12:21 13:24	added 74:12	adverse 116:8	142:19 151:11
	120:19 122:11		152:25 153:15
14:1,14,16 42:13		196:23 200:10	154:1 156:15
49:21 50:15 76:22	124:4	211:23 215:4	163:24 174:10
87:21 91:1 98:22	adding 276:14,17,	advice 124:13	
102:3 108:1	21 277:2	auvice 124.13	178:25 179:25
118:4,5 119:25	21211.2	affording 112:11	193:5 206:11
120:15 121:8	addition 65:20		223:22 229:6
	83:17,18 99:21	afraid 120:17	239:10,14 240:21
123:14 128:17	,		,
			<u> </u>
000 002 2767 Lavitas and		ad where required Nevede Degistr	NIEVITAC



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 78 of 111 Page! Dominique Delagnes July 09, 2024Index: aliquot..association

	Pagel D 47:141303	Delagnes July 09, 202	24111uex. aliquotassociatio
243:4 246:10,20,	allude 101:6	262:9	248:19 250:9
23 248:21 250:10,	alluding 159:2	answering 146:3,	251:2 252:3 257:1
11 251:3,4,23		10 147:1	262:13,20 263:5
252:1,4,5,25	alternative 38:13		283:13 284:6
253:1,9 260:2,25	55:10	anymore 117:1	Ari 269:10,19
261:2,19 263:7	Amanda 103:23	160:25 167:23	·
275:16 283:14	110:22 111:6	anytime 148:19	Armstrong 6:17
284:7	amandad 04.4	164:16	31:9,23 32:1
aliquot 271:12	amended 34:4	analasi-a 0.4	arose 221:9
	211:15	apologize 9:1	228:17
Aliquoting 182:15	American 9:22	96:16 270:16	- F4.40.00
aliquots 277:15	33:4 36:16 53:13	275:7	arrive 54:12,23
·	61:8 69:5 80:25	Apparently 24:25	arrived 54:17
allegation 38:1,24 101:16 162:13	200:16 201:14	appeal 173:18	125:21
198:21 199:23	225:22 226:20		Arrows 252:15,22
200:9 231:15	227:5 230:4	appears 104:14	253:10 269:4,6,
232:17 236:4	amino 132:11,21	110:5 234:20	23,25
232.17 230.4	133:1,2,12,13,15,	applicable 227:12,	,
allegations 48:14	17 134:10,20	22 228:3	Arthur 33:5
61:16 62:17,21	135:8 138:25	annragiated 00:9	article 197:5,7
63:6,8,12,15,22	139:9 144:14	appreciated 99:8	199:2 233:3,11
64:3,8,9 73:21	156:24	appropriately	234:1 254:10,19
74:2,20 75:15		267:7,21	asks 37:5,7 38:3,
77:18 79:1,5 80:1,	amount 248:23	approved 247:5	13 226:1
11 81:1,6,13,21	251:6		
82:11,23 83:7,19	Amy 195:1	approving 216:1	aspect 133:15
87:7 96:11,25	analysis 65:9 66:1	approximately	149:6
97:13,18 98:8	69:7 184:4 204:8	6:10 28:15 167:14	aspects 159:4
99:1,17,18,23,25	209:14 213:8,10,	April 104:16	assay 132:8,11,21
100:21 101:8,11,	17,21 214:13	243:11,25 244:21	133:2,3,13,15,17
12 103:3,6 106:9,		245:16 247:13	134:10,20 135:8,
12,13,19,23,24	Analyst 36:19	257:15 259:10,23	25 138:25 139:9
107:9,14,24 108:11 112:6	analytical 48:19	263:1,19,22 275:8	144:14 156:24
115:12 117:24	140:16	278:7,10	
118:9,10,13 121:6	analytically 23:24	416.7	assessments
123:9,11 152:13	50:17	area 116:7	38:14 55:10
155:16 156:10		areas 156:20	assigned 13:20
196:11,12,16	analytics 210:13	158:7,12	14:22
197:3 220:13	analyzed 205:10,	arguing 243:3	assist 167:23
221:7,12,25 222:1	13		207:14
223:11,12 224:13,	analyzer 135:1	argumentative	
16 227:11 229:10,	_	29:19 48:5 59:25	assistance 17:20
15 230:22 231:3,6	and/or 21:14	80:14 82:16 91:15	assisted 193:7
	71:15 92:8 216:3	103:10 108:20	
alleging 196:24	annual 258:19,21	109:24 121:19	Associates' 106:5
allowed 148:6	259:2 261:15	239:9 240:15,20 243:3 246:9	association
		243.3 240.9	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
			NIEVITAC



104:16,22 255:3 **August** 208:17 204:15 228:22 73:25 74:6 76:17 229:2,9 230:16 94:14 98:3,5 **assume** 111:10 authority 252:9, 232:10,24,25 110:13 117:13 154:21 173:20 11,13 233:16,17 234:2, 141:14 142:22 183:20 263:11,14 Aver 92:19 192:11 143:3 144:7 21 235:17,22 **assumes** 88:25 236:4,16 237:1 145:14.17 149:5 Averhealth 7:21 89:15 90:2 107:13 247:19,25 248:12, 158:25 162:22 9:9,15,20 10:4,9, 133:24 142:17 24 249:24 250:1, 172:22 178:5,8 24 11:2,13 12:15 143:21 153:14 15,21 251:18 184:18 207:3 13:3,9 14:5 16:1 193:3 199:25 252:8,10,18 209:2 213:8.16 17:12,13 20:25 223:20 246:9 253:21 254:9 223:6 224:15 22:23 25:13.18 248:19 251:1,24 255:4.15 257:8 230:1 231:8 233:2 26:12 27:6 29:1 253:8 259:24 263:19 264:1,4,16 247:3 261:25 30:22 32:17 37:7. 260:23 261:18 265:18 267:16,18 265:2,5 269:5,7 9 39:19 44:17 263:5 278:16 279:12,16 270:21,25 271:25 45:1,17 46:15 280:9 assumption 203:5 47:10 48:22 50:1, backdate 163:22 20 52:17 54:25 Averhealth's 164:7 assurance 64:12 58:2 61:17 62:10 25:10 26:21 27:4 backdated 164:17 astounded 29:11 66:16 69:14 38:8 41:8 47:15 71:12,13 73:20 background attached 28:6.9 76:16 83:20 91:20 74:18,19 75:15 127:5,23 128:18, 99:5 105:11 32:18 175:4 20 129:1,11 76:13 77:3,4,12 177:21 216:23 107:2,10,25 108:3 79:21 83:20 130:13,14 111:8 135:16 217:14 218:5 92:13,20 94:17,18 164:25 170:10 backing 49:20 attachment 28:10. 95:23 96:3 97:12 171:8 173:16 11,12,14,15 30:13 **bad** 23:20 24:8 98:20 99:19 191:16 201:21 56:5 185:8 104:23 105:10 210:17 233:22 106:5 111:22 attachments 249:5 267:1 bas- 119:4 28:16,22 29:8 112:11 114:10,14 Avertest 6:13 **based** 87:17 91:5 30:18 115:3,16 117:16, 203:7 99:19 118:8 123:9 25 118:8 129:24 attempt 44:7 125:25 145:16 aware 30:23 55:24 135:4.11 140:7 52:18 162:25 188:6 144:6 150:20 62:7 137:1 139:19 220:3 230:22 attempting 274:8 152:13 164:16 151:8 154:8 256:1 161:13 163:21 200:12 232:13,20 attending 6:21 164:6,17,19,22 253:24 basically 25:2 attention 68:1 165:10 166:4 79:19 201:10 142:2,6,13,15 167:11 168:9,24 В **basis** 40:4 60:6 144:24 178:19 169:9,19,21 84:2 85:16 106:9 204:22 205:6 170:6,25 171:24 **B-E-N** 269:13 119:5,16,22 215:4 252:21 172:8,10,12,14,18 120:6,8 121:13 B-E-N-N-E-C-E-R-I-173:1 175:9 177:9 attorney 53:19 122:17 123:2 **F** 269:16 184:23 185:17 attorneys 6:21 161:2,18 165:12 187:25 189:24 back 10:12 11:20 168:10 170:5 48.8 190:18 191:8,12 15:22 16:22 24:18 174:5 274:12,25 audits 254:24 192:6,22 193:13 26:24 36:13 52:21 281:20 282:9,17



57:7 61:5 71:9

195:7 197:12

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Pagel Dominigus Delagnes

Page: 80 of 111 July 09, 2024Index: batch..CAP 283:7,10 **big** 159:8 88:13 89:21 called 22:22 42:25 90:10,17 99:19 70:5 142:1,5,12, **batch** 22:14,17 bigger 48:24 117:25 177:9 14 144:23 156:20 145:13,22 216:1 **binders** 34:19 178:19 264:16 202:15 209:17 271:25 215:10 220:7 **bit** 157:19 173:23 Broussard 80:17, Bates 31:18 32:4 230:16 252:21 268:16 20 66:10 103:25 265:24 266:13,21 blame 45:22 46:6, buck 123:17 110:25 174:22 calls 27:22 49:4, 9 175:11 189:23 bullet 37:20 38:17 10 50:10 51:25 200:21 201:25 **body** 80:1,24 88:2, 40:15 62:25 63:1 52:4,8,12 75:7 210:4 219:21 3,6,8 241:14 71:19 72:16 78:8 86:21 89:16 90:1 227:1 243:15 236:12,14 243:9 91:15 97:20 100:2 **Booker** 53:6,15 254:10 259:7 254:22 259:18 103:10 113:2 borderline 127:3, **Bates-stamped** 115:21 126:10 **bullets** 63:9,13 21 128:10,23 159:5 127:11,14 128:1, 236:9 255:14 **borne** 99:10 11 129:14 130:13 bears 254:10 business 7:16 131:17 132:15 259:6 boss 18:11 124:11 8:10,12 48:10 136:6 142:17 begin 215:24 116:6 117:1 **bottle** 278:4 151:10 152:1,23 118:24 119:1,4,6, beginning 39:4 153:13,24 156:14 **bottom** 13:1,6 9,10,16,18,19,22 174:9 178:24 76:23 77:1 136:5 19:20,24 24:20 120:2,3,7,8,10,17, 187:9 217:14 179:9 206:10 55:4,7 22 121:12,13,21, 223:20 246:11,18 218:7 265:12 **Boyd** 94:18 95:17 24,25 122:5,17 **CAP** 9:21 10:4,13 begins 6:11 96:7,10,23 97:11, 123:3,18,20 184:23 15:23 20:24 22:2, 16 98:6,19,25 124:15 233:24 12 23:1 24:2,7 99:7,23 100:1,12 behalf 7:2,10 9:6 25:11,17 27:1,3,7 101:2 103:4,8 10:9 13:8 14:4 C 28:23 29:1,7,8,15, 25:13 38:18 45:16 bracketing 236:18 16 30:1,7,20,21 161:12 165:10 **C1** 28:12 bragging 238:22 32:16 33:9 34:1,9 **belief** 81:12 C2 28:14 36:18,19 37:5 breach 50:20 38:18 43:14 44:3, believed 15:1 calibration 41:20 break 60:24 61:3 4,17,20 45:7,25 23:22 26:8 30:9 43:7.12 71:15 94:9,12 117:11 52:24 54:8,25 49:16 117:22 92:8 216:5 184:16 229:20,24 55:8 57:3 58:6,7, 121:9 232:3 calibrations 53:10 10 59:6,11 61:15, breaking 94:5 believes 26:12 64:19 20 63:6,15,21,22 bring 48:24 98:20 64:2,25 65:6,15 calibrator 41:1,3,4 156:17 265:2,5 67:15 71:10,12,19 Benacerraf 269:13 215:22 bringing 91:12 72:3,15 73:7,19, benzoylecgonine calibrators 41:19 102:8 20 74:2,18,22,24 57:12 92:15 75:4,6,15 76:12 **broad** 116:12 **bet** 171:15 call 68:1 126:10 77:17 78:1,8,9,24 124:14 268:7 144:5 167:25 79:25 80:10 81:3, **bias** 37:22 38:9 broadly 185:4 183:11 5,23 83:9 84:13 65:8 66:1 93:5,7 85:4,11,18,24 brought 77:4



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 81 of 111

Page Dominique Delagnes July 09, 2024 Index: Cap's..certification

86:7,9,19 87:6 88:1,10 91:20 92:1 93:5 95:24, 25 96:1,4,11 97:12 98:21 99:1, 10,18,20 100:21 101:11,17,20 102:9 103:6 106:22 107:7,8,22 108:9,13 112:5,16 113:8,12,20,24 114:4,19 115:10 117:19,25 118:7, 9,12 119:2 120:18 123:10 151:3,4 156:10 164:23 165:3,13,23 166:7,9,12 167:1, 6 176:4,12 180:24 181:3 184:22 189:21,24,25 190:17 191:18 192:11,14 194:25 195:3,6 196:23 197:2 198:21 199:15 201:14 203:11 207:3 210:12,16,22 211:2,22,24 214:13,20,22 217:1 219:14 221:10 224:10 225:8 226:22 227:5,20 228:8,22 229:1,9 230:12 231:2,8 232:10, 16,25 233:16 234:11 235:15,16 236:3,21,24 237:5,18 238:7,8, 24,25 240:9 241:2,7,19 242:2, 24 243:11,25 244:5,10,11,14, 21,22 245:1,3,7, 11,14,18,20 246:5 247:12 248:8

DUC. #. 100-29
Pagel D ominiqig
257:9,14,23 258:3
259:9 262:25
263:11,18 264:2,5
273:3 275:1
276:13,16
CAP's 26:6 29:14
36:23 59:15 61:10
92:19 165:25

CAP's 26:6 29:14 36:23 59:15 61:10 92:19 165:25 201:8 217:5 230:6 238:3,19 241:11 259:22 277:9

CAP- ACCREDITED107:4,18 156:6

CAP-FDT 96:25 120:1 227:13 228:4,12 234:21

Capital 252:16

care 12:14 210:17 245:21

career 47:24

careful 137:8

carries 13:7 88:9

carrying 13:1

case 6:13 23:3,4
30:20 31:6 36:4
46:16 66:2 75:12
76:3,6,15 81:23
86:17 88:13 89:2,
9 90:9,10,14,16,
17,18 91:6,11,12
117:17 135:19
144:13 157:4
168:21,25 169:11,
14 170:8 171:1,7,
23 172:3,9,25
174:4,15 237:5
272:7 279:11,16
280:6 282:14

cases 47:23 50:4 105:12 145:7 146:16 168:19 169:16 170:15 171:12,14 caseworker 12:16 145:14,17

caseworkers 145:23

categories 268:7

caused 144:13 145:6 150:3,7

CCR 6:4

Cejas 7:2 27:22 29:18 31:5,13 32:8,20,24 35:6, 22 36:5 48:4 49:3, 10 50:9 51:22,25 52:4,8,12 59:1,20, 24 60:21,25 75:7 80:5,13 82:4,7,15 84:21 86:21 88:22,24 89:15 90:1,13 91:14 94:1,3 97:20 98:10 99:11 100:2 102:10,13,16,19, 23 103:9,17 107:13 108:15,19 109:19,23 112:20 113:2,14,21 115:18,21 116:9 117:5 120:11 121:15,18 122:1, 15,18 123:1,4 127:11,14,25 128:11 129:14 130:1 131:17 132:15 133:23 134:24 135:23 136:5,9,16 139:24 142:16 143:21 145:25 146:2,5,7, 9,12,19,22 147:1, 4,6,11,14,17,19 148:2,6 149:13, 16,21,25 150:12 151:9 152:1,23 153:13,24 155:18

156:13 159:1,19, 24 160:1,9,15 161:7,10,15,22 162:1 163:12,23 164:8 168:5 171:7,19,23 172:5 173:2,13,16,18,22 174:8,12 178:23 179:8,24 181:23 188:19,24 189:8, 10 192:25 193:3 199:25 206:9 223:19 229:4,11, 18 239:4,8,13 240:12,14,19 242:13,17,19 243:2,15,20 246:8,17,21 247:21 248:18 249:2,11,14,18 250:8,11,25 251:22,24 252:2, 5,23 253:1,7 256:25 258:10,16 259:24 260:11,22 261:1,17 262:3, 12,16,20 263:2,4, 22 266:16 269:15 270:7 272:16,19 273:2,7,10,11 275:12,17 276:23 279:6,14 280:2,12 283:12 284:5 285:8

Central 6:10

CEO 8:2 9:14 18:11 94:18 123:17,23 248:15, 25 249:10,20

certificate 177:22 214:19

certification 98:22 120:1,25 122:6 123:6 165:13 166:10 214:20,22 216:20



certified 119:25 171:3.14 250:18 committee 61:11 121:4,5 123:12 62:14 65:7 226:22 CLIA 52:24 53:14 **children** 89:3,5,9, 230:6 235:15 certifying 236:9 12,23,25 90:11,19 227:19,21,25 270:23 91.13 228:7 243:11 communicated 244:1,3,5,9,12,18, 154:22 chain 185:21 **choice** 256:17 22,23 245:1,3,7, 186:5,16 268:2, communication **choose** 50:18 11 257:9 14,16 277:13 70:17 152:14 chose 48:18 50:18 clients 12:1 154:23 232:10,16, chair 61:11 226:22 59:9 60:5 256:12 142:22 21 254:9 230:7 257:4 clinical 177:23 communications challenges 37:21 Christina 66:21 153:11 264:2 close 129:18 **chance** 218:2 70:17 125:11 communities 142:25 143:25 **COLA** 177:24 275:18,22 11:5,14 **change** 43:4,6,12 Christine 161:16 **Colin** 103:24 companies 115:14 44:1.2 92:22 110:24 chromatography 116:5,7,22 131:12,15 214:6 92:21 93:2 156:25 College 9:22 33:4 company 18:12 36:16 53:13 61:8 changed 72:12 circumstance 123:24 161:13 92:13,20 131:2 69:5 80:24 200:16 163:20 164:6 248:15 250:4 163:4 264:18 201:14 225:22 circumstances 226:20 227:5 company's 83:21 **changing** 43:6,11 68:11 230:4 46:7,21,23 47:2,4 comparable cited 43:4 65:4 48:17 53:10,11 Collum 226:21 168:22,25 97:14 **charge** 269:4,6 **combine** 281:16 compared 133:2 **City** 269:21 256:2 **charts** 194:11 comfortable 25:21 civil 170:8 171:1, 70:6 71:2 comparing 180:19 **chat** 66:16 67:11 12,17,18,22 **comment** 181:24 comparison 214:1 chats 284:21 **claim** 49:9 50:19, 182:1 215:18 competency **check** 167:25 20 51:19,20,24 177:24 commentary 270:17 198:11 279:12 249:15 **compile** 282:19 checklist 64:25 claimed 45:16 commented 32:17 65:1,5 166:11 115:13 compiled 281:11 204:18 214:25 177:23 203:5,6,8, claiming 50:8 complainant 11.14 commenting 88:17 89:22 90:17 13:12 14:4,5 30:21 checklists 203:9 100:18 21:23 22:6 **comments** 30:2,8, chemical 276:15 **claims** 46:15 49:1, complained 43:21 10 177:22,25 25 50:12 54:20 144:23 cherry-picked 182:23,24 202:12, 55:2 77:12,18 127:9 130:23 complaint 27:11 16 204:4 209:9 83:8 32:15,19 34:12, chief 7:20,22,23, commissioner **clanged** 163:15 20,21 48:15 50:25 25 8:5 77:2,3 220:23 59:15 198:19 211:16 212:1 clear 16:20 70:7 committed 11:3 221:8,9,10 227:7 71:3 216:12 **child** 88:14,18 15:8 252:14 228:10,16,17 217:6,9 221:6



230:18,22 232:11 65:25 156:20 confident 74:2 continually 234:21 235:7 158:8,12 196:20 96:10,24 97:17 140:22 237:5 239:2 242:3 197:19 98:7 99:3 114:7 continuation 118:3.14 121:8 complaints 27:8. concerned 62:15 212:23 123:13 20 34:4 47:2 64:11 65:8 222:11 continue 25:22 73:11,16 196:7 231:16 confidentiality 43:16,25 226:21 227:7 45:10 concerns 21:13 continued 98:22 228:23 229:2 22:3,7,11,19,21 **confirm** 133:2 221:20 273:17 24:2,5 25:12 26:7 135:15 138:2 continuing 118:5 complete 13:19 139:14 217:20 44:25 65:16,22 209:3 222:4 14:5,22 15:1 77:3,5,8 78:5,7 262:8,24 263:16 223:18 224:20 216:3 256:1 152:8 156:19,23 confirmation 267:13 continuous 21:24 conclude 87:11 28:11,21 30:13 254:25 89:24 90:9 246:15 132:20 133:14 completed 16:15 183:18 208:2 144:15,16,19 continuously concluded 9:12 215:10 226:5,14 257:8 208:3 115:16 282:7,14 271:1 confirmatory contract 50:20 concluding 27:14 completely 77:14 64:13 51:2,4,8,9,13,15 conclusion 49:11 79:5,9,14 81:14 114:15 162:25 confirmed 139:9 52:9,13 79:20 82:12,24 83:10 271:17,19 235:16 80:10 174:9 271:21 contractual 47:17 226:13 246:18 **confirms** 259:21 compliance 196:6. 281:21 282:18,23 contrary 89:20 confused 82:19 22 200:9 210:22 224:16 conclusions 220:23 221:15,20 confusing 215:25 159:10 161:3 222:4 223:15,18 **control** 14:7 38:19 consideration 282:10 283:9 224:19,21 231:2 39:16 40:22 64:22 86:16 284:2 71:16,20,22 156:4 complied 225:17 considered 86:18 194:15 205:10 condition 196:5 comply 44:7 148:21 177:25 214:2 215:19 conditions 57:24 217:4.7 206:6 212:8,16 216:19,23,24 **conduct** 45:9.16 213:25 218:4,18 236:10 complying 83:21 164:20,25 245:14 250:17 251:14,21 considers 39:4 compound 108:20 252:7 267:23,24 conducted 166:5, 223:24 239:9 consist 207:1 277:18 17 244:1,6,12,14, 252:2 consistent 26:20 18 245:3.11 controls 15:22 computer 201:8 27:3 57:23 58:3 247:13 248:8 92:9,15 215:13,14 84:2 85:16 140:23 **conceal** 103:10 259:9 279:18 236:17 255:4 274:11,24 concealed 103:7 conversations conference 176:6. consultant 177:23 8 177:7 181:7,11, 17:16 281:10 concealing 116:8 12,15,16 182:3 contained 185:9. **COO** 9:15 concentrations 183:7,11 186:23 11,14 128.7 cooperating confidence context 35:16 118:12 **concern** 21:15,16 105:14 112:11 70:14 274:7 22:16 64:18,21 copies 28:20 29:4,



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 84 of 111

Page Dominique Delagnes July 09, 2024Index: copy..correct 6 30:5 161:9,12,19,23 11,15,21,24 150:25 151:5,6,8, 15 152:19 153:12, 162:4 163:13,14 39:17,21,25 **copy** 29:24 103:18 164:3,11 171:10 40:13,22 41:9,15, 23 154:14,23 174:25 172:7 173:5,20,24 21.24 42:11.23 155:4,21 156:1,2, copy's 218:11 174:13 179:2,11, 43:2,24 44:5,21 12,16,25 157:14 12 180:2 181:25 45:1,24 47:12,15, 161:7,15,25 Cornfeld 6:23 7:12 182:2 184:10,19 25 48:2 49:24 162:7,11 165:4 28:2 29:25 31:8, 188:6,21 189:2,9, 50:1,23 51:6,14, 167:3 170:19,20 21 32:14,23 33:2 17 53:18,19 54:15 172:13,17,23 20 193:1 200:2,5 35:2,11 36:14 222:22 223:1.3.7. 57:16 58:11 59:8, 174:7,15,16 48:11 49:7,13 25 229:6,12,16,19 16,23 60:2 61:21, 175:21 177:8 50:19 51:23 52:2. 179:7,23 180:24 230:2 239:5,11,15 24 62:3,16,22 16 59:3,4,21 60:3, 240:16,22 242:15, 63:3,8,18,23 181:4 185:10 18,23 61:6 74:11, 18,20 243:8,18,21 64:13,22 65:2,17, 186:11,24 187:6, 14,17 75:11,25 246:13,20,23 18,22 66:16,19, 7,11,16,22 188:3 80:6,19 82:5,8,21 20,22,23 67:10, 247:23 248:25 190:18,23 191:2, 84:22 85:8,10 6,19,23 192:15 249:4,8,9,13,16, 15,16 68:19,25 87:2 89:1,19 90:7, 20 250:10,14 69:1 71:5,6 72:4, 195:14 196:12,18 15 91:18 93:24 251:4,23 252:1,4, 13,14 73:1,8 74:4 197:16 198:11,25 94:7,15 97:24 8,25 253:3,13,18, 75:12,13 76:10,20 199:24 200:18 98:2,13 99:16 20 254:2,6 257:6 77:19 78:10 79:2. 202:9,12 203:15 100:9 102:11,15, 258:11,18 260:2, 6,12,15 80:2 83:6, 204:17,22 206:4, 18,21,24 103:14, 14,25 261:2,20 11 84:11,19 86:3, 8,22 208:18 19,21 104:13 8,14,20 87:14 262:15,18,21 209:22 210:17 107:20 108:16,25 89:10,11,14 90:12 211:6,18 212:5,25 263:3,10,24 268:1 109:20 110:3 269:18 272:14 92:3,16,21 93:2,8, 213:1 214:9 112:23 113:7.19 273:1,5,8 275:10, 13,18 95:24 96:4, 215:6,16 217:1,5, 114:1 115:19 15 276:19 279:5, 12 97:2,3,7,8,13, 7,8,10,11,15,24 116:3.14 117:4.7. 13,25 280:15 19 98:9,17 100:1 218:8,12,22 14 120:16 121:16, 283:19 284:13 103:8,13 104:17 219:4,7,14,18 23 122:8,16,21, 105:12,15,23 221:1,4,10,16,21 22,24 123:2,7 corporate 8:20,23 106:2,6,9,19,20, 222:5 223:18 127:12,19 128:3, 9:9 35:20 201:1 25 107:1 108:14 224:22 225:5.6.17 16 129:20 130:3 **correct** 8:2,3,7,9 109:1,16,18 110:1 226:2,5,15 131:22 133:4 9:10,16,24,25 111:9,13,14,17, 228:16,17,18,23, 134:6 135:17,24 10:10,11 12:2,9, 18,20,21 112:7,8, 24 229:3,10,15 136:8,14,17,18 22,23 13:10 16:1 16 113:1 114:11, 230:13,19,23 140:3 142:21 17:25 18:17,18 12,16,17 115:8 231:4,9,10,18,19, 144:3 146:1,4,6,8, 19:22,23 20:18, 116:16 117:1 22,23 233:19 11,14,21,25 21,22,25 21:10,11 124:23 125:12,15, 234:4,9,12 235:8, 147:3,5,10,13,15, 22:3,4,8,9,24 22 126:4,12,16 18,23,24 240:8, 18,21 148:4,8,12 23:16,17 24:4 127:24 128:10,19 18,22,23,25 149:15,18,22 25:3,22 26:3 129:13 131:14 241:22,23 244:7, 150:2,10,13 27:20 28:7,8,16, 133:22 134:10,11, 23 245:12,16 151:13 152:5 17 29:17 30:3 15,16,23 136:20, 246:16 252:19 153:6,20 154:4 34:10 35:20 36:24 21,23 138:10 255:19 259:14,19 155:20 156:18 37:6,9,12,23 38:1, 139:1,7,23 142:2 262:11 263:3,19 159:14 160:5,21



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 85 of 111 Page! Dominique Delagnes July 09, 2024Index: corrected..deciding

268:22.25 272:2 85:11,13,17 86:3, customers 26:23. date 6:9 124:25 275:22 276:10 13,15,17,18,20,22 25 116:20 118:6. 169:7 195:24 280:21 281:1,7,9 87:1,5,12 95:18 7,15 119:1 120:23 196:1 202:8 96:24 117:17 121:10 123:8,9,15 208:20,24 213:13 corrected 109:8 218:10,12 225:19 171:2 188:14 124:5,6 144:7 131:8 141:15 222:24 223:2 163:1 232:24 233:8 264:21,23, 145:21 163:3 262:5 233:24 234:3 25 211:15 215:5 235:20 236:2,7, 277:1 **Court's** 87:3,4 dated 9:22 33:6 20,21,24 237:8, 36:17 44:3,19 correcting 109:1, **courts** 11:21 11,18 238:12,16, 54:8 61:9 91:21 5,11,17 230:17 25 239:6,18,22,23 cover 30:12 103:24 124:21,22 235:17 241:19 242:2,24 154:18 133:5 150:17 245:22 246:5 correction 93:6 174:23 175:5 covered 10:13 247:19 250:22 174:2 178:5 179:23 175:10 233:23 251:19 253:6,12 189:21,25 195:1 corrections 254:18 255:21 create 209:6 202:6 219:14 108:12 223:17 256:7,9,10,14,23 creatinine 204:9 225:22 226:24 224:20 **cutoff** 129:18 228:21 230:4 **credible** 23:7.14 corrective 38:4 132:25 135:9 dates 167:12,16 71:23 72:18,20 criminal 171:16 264:18 168:1 175:10 93:7.8 149:4,5,10, criteria 276:25 **cutoffs** 162:25 23 150:6 190:21 **Datto** 61:10 230:6 277:19 163:5,15 209:7 221:20 **David** 6:18 222:3 234:22 cross-reactivity cutting 147:7 235:8 266:22 day 15:25 17:18 135:7 CV 177:22 62:3 158:3 186:10 correctly 68:23 cross-reference **cycle** 271:22 195:13,18,19,23 134:2 143:20 183:2 197:12 213:8 255:11 crossed 255:2 D day-to-day 161:18 282:7 **CSR** 6:4 209.12 correspondence d/b/a 203:7 **curve** 41:13,19 253:11 days 208:2 225:10 43:7.12 **daily** 170:4 247:19 264:14 **cost** 119:13 266:25 curves 71:15 92:8 Daniels 195:1 counsel 6:2 216:5 deadline 285:3 dashboard 210:13 **count** 47:23 custodies 268:16 December 33:6 data 40:6 41:13 counting 247:17 36:17,24 37:1 custody 88:18 53:24 57:24 44:4 105:22 **County** 76:4 90:11 91:12 126:14 143:2.10. 208:17 171:3,15 185:21 13 192:10 193:9 **couple** 34:10 95:5 186:5,16 268:3,14 208:8 254:24 decide 91:5 126:19 264:14 277:14 281:15 282:20,23 255:24 256:10,15 court 6:14 7:4 284:11 customer 144:11 decided 48:22 12:11,13 52:10 253:22 254:9 database 15:10 121:17 76:4 77:7 80:24 257:2 263:25 70:19 162:24 81:5,13,15 82:25 deciding 171:3 264:1 163:3 83:10 84:7,15,24



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 86 of 111 Page! Dominique Delagnes July 09, 2024Index: decision..distributed

decision 48:10 defined 92:25 describes 215:20 **diploma** 177:22 86:17 115:23 **defines** 203:12 description 14:7 direct 17:14 118:24 119:5,6, 15:3 20:1 **Delagnes** 6:12 directed 44:20 10,17,18,20,23 7:8,15 33:3 61:6 design 214:21 187:10 226:23 120:2,4,7,8,9,10 117:14 148:13 121:12,14,22,25 designating **director** 14:6 15:2 159:16 160:7,11 122:6 123:3,18, 172:16 20:1 41:14 67:2,6, 161:24 184:19 20,23 233:24 7 69:11 152:14 designation 35:20 188:8 230:2 256:23 262:13,14 155:25 175:10,15, 273:12 designee 9:9 23 178:4 179:5,22 decisions 124:15 41:14 201:1 delivered 200:11 180:12,19,25 deck 104:15,23 184:3 186:14 destroyed 271:9 delivery 62:2 112:4 234:20 195:2 203:24 235:21 236:23 **detail** 71:23 **demand** 92:19 211:16,25 157:24 158:2 decks 111:17 demonstrate disagree 42:16,20, 113:10 detailed 21:15 52:17,18 21 120:20 128:20 38:3 71:14 92:7 deem 74:2 96:25 **Department** 9:21 disagreement details 157:8 31:11 46:1 47:6, **deemed** 97:12 216:3 182:4,18 184:4,5 10 48:1,13,21 defendant 6:3 7:3 discipline 252:9, 49:15,22 50:7 **detect** 209:12 170:17 171:8 12 54:5 111:3 114:22 172:10 detected 209:13 disciplined 253:21 departments defensible 23:25 determination 11:21 disclosures 52:23 267:6 279:22 280:4 188:25 departure 77:11 deficiencies 207:4 determine 241:16 discover 148:17 **depend** 158:16 219:3 225:10 determined discrediting 45:11 230:17 235:18,23 dependent 160:25 144:16 227:12 244:2,4,7,9,11,13, discrepancies 228:3 **Depends** 187:18 15,19 245:19,20 40:9 268:23 deviation 72:23 246:5 247:14 discussed 53:10 248:9 254:24 deposes 7:10 dextromethorphan 73:24 253:15 255:3 257:10,15, 16:25 deposing 143:24, 23 259:13,19,22 discussion 36:10 25 **DHHS** 150:22 260:9,10,18 75:23 104:10 deposition 6:3,11, 261:8,14 262:2,7, 158:22 159:1 difference 171:5 16 9:11,13 35:20 10,23,25 263:13, 184:14 189:15,18 differentiate 124:19 147:7 18,20 276:1,5 disgruntled 77:11 217:19 150:16 185:3 278:6.9 188:14 201:1 disorders 11:6,18 difficult 130:14 deficiency 201:15 252:21 254:7 **disposed** 173:14, 204:7 205:22 **Diloretta** 66:22,24 265:12 21,24 174:4 67:18 68:8 69:10 207:2 208:21 depositions 70:1,11,23 210:15 216:9,18 disregarded 45:8 143:23 188:23 217:8,11,20,21,24 dilute-and-shoot distraction 48:9 218:5,19 225:13 **deprive** 157:22 26:1 distributed 111:7 **define** 109:5



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 87 of 111 Page! Dominigue Delagnes July 09, 2024Index: District..essentially

District 6:14 **Doell** 6:18 15 42:4,7,12 268:19 269:2.22 103:22 124:20,21, employees 21:13 **divides** 156:23 **DOJ** 100:24 25 154:15 174:23 84:1,9,18 85:15 **Doane** 103:23 domestic 170:8 177:20 178:2,22 187:4 254:17 110:22 111:6 171:1,14 179:3,18,19 265:13,15 267:7, 219:13,20,23 Dominique 6:12 **doctor** 43:19 22 274:10,23 220:20 7:8,15 80:15 148:13 employment 159:8 160:11 **e-mailing** 125:10 document 15:17 168:1 250:17 220:19 255:8 16:25 30:16.17 **e-mails** 30:21 251:14,21 252:7 66:9 93:23 96:15 double 82:19 85:6 117:19 284:14,19 enclosed 54:11 101:15 110:12 **DRA** 202:17 203:4 Earle 226:21 55:14 150:24 162:24 205:22 163:22 164:7,17 earlier 78:25 97:17 encouraged 17:24 **DRA.10440** 210:2 174:21 175:9 98:7 99:3,9 18:1 176:17 180:8 111:19 170:15 draft 177:25 encouraging 192:17 194:7 178:6 264:7 18:14 19:3 draw 226:14 200:16,23 201:13, 275:21 278:17,22 end 11:2.11 18:12 16 202:15 216:22 279:7 **driven** 144:15 37:16 40:5 220:6 224:17 235:4 drop 115:17 easier 127:10,12, 275:7 236:2,6 237:2 24 128:8,14,16 116:25 238:13 240:13 ends 132:20 130:24 265:10 **dropped** 114:10 254:1,8,13,16 engaged 13:13 115:3,20 281:16 Eastern 6:14 260:15 264:8,9 266:1,7 275:18 enhancements drug 11:15 12:18, edit 95:13 281:2,4 22:15,18 20 46:14 77:5 **effect** 101:5 88:17 112:12 documentation **ensure** 70:19 160:25 128:6 172:4 86:9 91:22 92:2,6, 267:25 effective 203:25 196:24 278:11 23 93:23 205:8 ensuring 203:25 221:14 223:14 **effort** 234:2 drugs 25:6,16 entail 195:8 233:2 253:11 282:19 70:21 76:17 89:14 277:17 281:15,25 139:15 207:15 entire 12:14 15:11 electronic 275:7 282:3 277:8 119:25 211:20 else's 223:21 231:23 268:3 documented due 132:23 196:7 embrace 10:18 143:7 148:15 entities 11:22 duties 13:20 14:6. 97:5 183:22 22 15:1,19,24 entitled 105:17 embraces 10:24 documents 28:7 16:3 110:6 150:20 29:14 30:20 31:24 employed 69:13 158:12 207:2 dying 224:8 32:6,17 33:8,9 77:10 234:20 254:8 34:2,9,17 35:7,10, employee 17:12 error 20:17 145:19 12,15 96:17 Ε 19:4,22 20:21 148:16 165:2 **errors** 140:19,25 69:23 77:10 83:20 169:13 220:7 e-mail 16:20 17:2, 209:8 161:14 164:21,22 228:14 266:13 10 18:11,14,25 essentially 206:7 165:11 166:4 280:23,24 21:23 24:14,19 223:12 276:13 167:10,15,18,20 25:23 26:4 34:13, 207:22 266:1,22



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 88 of 111 Page! Dominique Delagnes July 09, 2024Index: Essington..extremely

Essington 66:21 264:20 61:7,14,19 62:9 expensive 48:8,9 70:3,17,23 71:1 63:7 66:6,9 71:9 examination 7:11 expert 22:22 125:11 143:1 76:1 91:19 94:16 210:12 272:18 161:20 162:2 144:1 95:9 96:18,21,22 168:22,24 169:1, 280:14 97:11 98:16 establish 221:3 10,11,20 170:4,7, examined 7:9 103:22 104:14 25 172:3,9,16 established 15:25 110:4 113:9 examples 26:17, 174:6,14,17 16:4 124:19 150:16 18 39:3 40:21 188:25 189:3,5,7, 152:6 174:21 **ethical** 45:9,15 41:7 14 281:22,23 175:9.24 177:6 285:3 **Eugene** 164:19 **Excel** 126:1 180:21 181:19 174:23 205:16 **experts** 282:1,3 182:2 183:6.9 evaluate 155:17 184:2,20 185:24 exchange 219:13, explain 56:18 24 284:14 186:11,24 189:21, 57:18 85:9 137:15 evaluated 112:10 23 190:17 191:16, 144:11 154:9 113:11,12,18,24 exchanging 21 194:25 198:22 157:12 228:6 188:11 evaluating 38:1 200:2,6,15 240:6 255:9 excluded 39:12 201:13,24 202:2 evaluation 37:15 explained 37:11 41:14 205:20 206:25 38:9 65:8,25 137:16 147:24 207:1,8,13 208:13 72:17 106:5 excuse 13:4 23:11 209:3,24 210:20 explaining 212:12, 210:11 42:19 46:3 54:21 211:13 212:23 15 228:2 78:14,16 81:4 evaluations 213:4 214:14 82:3,5 88:5,8 89:8 explanation 71:14 112:15,19 113:1 215:8,9 217:14 90:7,22,24 93:22 92:7 234:3 218:25 219:1,9,12 evaporate 271:21 99:16,22,24 explanations 225:21 226:19 102:12 103:3.14 evasive 170:1 71:11 227:23 228:20 112:23,25 128:23 events 105:18,21 229:9 230:3 146:4,6,8,11,14 express 62:1 106:1 111:16,23 231:16 234:19 148:13 169:10 expressed 22:2,21 114:20 234:9 236:6 243:9,19 171:4 180:14 24:3,5 26:7 254:7 259:2 261:4 192:11 202:5 evidence 87:13 272:21,22,24 expressly 6:6 88:25 89:16 90:3 210:3 211:11 273:4,23 275:4 215:8 222:8,10,12 91:6 107:14 **extent** 31:15 224:10 236:13 133:24 142:17 exhibits 32:19 32:11,21 35:24 237:10,13 241:5 143:22 153:14 35:25 273:12 97:21 161:16 242:21 245:1,5 193:4 200:1 174:8 178:24 exist 285:1 249:13 260:14 220:13,14 223:20 179:9 192:25 exonerate 229:5 224:13,25 246:9 206:9 **executive** 7:23 8:1 248:19 251:1,25 exonerated 229:1, external 72:18 **exhibit** 9:19 10:17 253:8 259:25 9 13:1 15:15,20 260:23 261:18 extra 165:11 expect 27:6 24:16,18 25:24 263:5 extraneous 182:1 187:13 188:8 27:15 28:6,10 **Ew** 163:8 32:15 33:3 36:15 **extremely** 25:6,17 **expected** 27:19,23 37:17 38:18 42:1, exact 29:22 79:7,8 29:16 30:1 111:12 3,4,8 44:10,14,17 167:12 168:1 expecting 167:1 45:6 54:9 55:5,6,9 195:25 242:6



			202 mask: lasimate::isiiew
	fairly 42:10,23	families 11:4,14	272:22
F	43:10 58:15,16	favor 173:16	finding 54:12,17,
6 1114 4 07 45	59:5		23 68:24 87:6,7
facilitate 37:15	faith 23:23	February 67:11	106:23 112:6
facility 277:23,24		76:10 82:10 84:24	212:9 216:8,15
	fall 227:19,20	91:21 94:20 95:19	217:1 221:24
fact 14:3 18:10	228:7	97:11 98:15,25	238:3
23:2 26:25 32:16	false 20:12,14	103:24 150:18	
37:25 38:23 45:23	49:25 55:22 76:19	152:12 233:6,13	findings 65:22
58:6 64:2 73:19,	82:14 83:1 84:25	234:1 273:24	99:10 159:10
24 74:3 77:20	88:18 132:2,8	federal 188:20	177:3 185:6,7
78:15 81:21,23	133:16 134:9,18		213:3 214:9
83:2 90:9,25	137:4,9,20,23	feel 70:6 71:2	220:10 227:7
99:14 100:7 121:9	138:7,9,13,14,20	80:23 81:5 127:1	238:19
132:24 135:6	139:6,8,18 142:9	feels 128:21	fine 32:13,24
141:5 159:9	144:3,8,9,20	felt 46:14 47:1	150:12 238:7
177:15 192:5,22	145:2,7 148:17		262:14
193:7 228:5	150:3 162:6,14	fentanyl 132:3,8,	
233:17 237:4	196:21,24 197:20	23 133:11 135:7,	finish 42:19 43:9
238:8 239:3 262:7	220:15 222:15	13,25 137:4,5,21,	136:15 146:10,19
270:10 272:21	223:9 225:1	25 139:7,14,22	fire 252:13
274:13	231:17 232:11,18	144:17	fireable 250:12
facts 88:25 89:16	236:4,5,22 237:6,	fib 81:15 260:20	251:13
90:2 106:8 107:14	7,19 238:9,10		
133:24 142:17	239:1 240:10	figure 57:13	firing 249:21
143:22 153:14	241:8 242:3,25	132:13 217:25	250:6,23 251:19
193:4 199:25	243:1 245:18	file 32:9 148:19	252:14
223:20 246:9	247:18,24 248:1,	filed 196:7 279:12,	firm 252:17
248:19 251:1,24	2,4,7,23 249:22	15,20 280:18	
253:8 259:25	250:22 251:6,17	,	firsthand 189:13
260:23 261:18	253:16,21 258:1	files 29:9 111:4	fitting 215:23
263:5	264:5,6	148:25 149:7,10,	five-year 114:15
factual 40:12	,	24 150:5,7 281:16	iive-yeai 114.15
41:23 60:6 189:11	falsehood 82:25	fill 201:9	flags 157:7
factually 40:3	falsely 257:14	find 15:15 16:25	flexibility 216:1
_	familiar 10:1 94:24	26:23 35:22 55:2	flip 274:2 275:25
failed 13:18 14:4,5	110:9 135:19	66:3 69:3 81:23	fluid 72:19 132:2,8
50:21 84:14 85:12	146:15 148:1,5,14	83:2 96:11 97:18	136:19,22,23
failing 15:1	150:24 163:18,19	98:8 99:4 112:21	137:7,21 139:7,22
failure 64:15	172:25 173:5	127:9 130:24	277:4,7
273:19	176:1,10 190:4	162:23 174:12	•
	192:5,21 193:6,	189:6 208:25	fluids 136:3
failures 22:13,16	22,25 199:7	220:12 224:12,25	FOIA 31:10,22,23
71:24	200:23 201:16	244:9,10 246:4	32:2,7
fair 200:13	227:2 230:10	258:8,17 262:1,6,	·
	234:25 254:13	22 263:12,21	follow 40:17,22
			41:8 64:16 84:1,
		1	



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 90 of 111

Pagel Dominique Delagnes July 09, 2024 Index: follow-up..government front 9:18 44:13 10,14 85:12,15 formalized 185:21 **Glinn** 9:23 10:9.17 86:10 167:13 61:7,13 94:15 11:1 13:4,8 14:4 format 201:3,11 177:17 178:21 189:20 230:3 15:18 19:25 forward 27:15 234:19 262:4 20:12,20 25:13 179:4 189:13 28:1 205:15 208:3 220:1 228:8,11 273:13 275:19 27:13,19 28:5 264:20 266:3,6 36:18 44:21.24 foster 254:25 **frozen** 278:3 267:7 268:2 45:5,16 54:10,19 Foulger 6:12 fulfill 14:2,15 273:19 274:10,23 56:5,10,18 57:14, 270:11 17,21 58:5,15,22 fulfilling 16:11,12, **follow-up** 264:14 found 23:3,7,12 60:17 61:9 67:5 18 17:14,15 18:25 food 117:5,6 45:25 46:16 91:21,25 92:13,18 19:15 56:10,21 62:20 124:21 125:10 forensically 23:24 full 13:18 43:5 126:5 130:16 63:2,17 64:2 52:23 267:5 54:9 57:22 63:12 131:25 134:8 73:20 74:4,19 forever 271:22 70:14 101:16 135:24 139:17 78:9 80:1,10,25 251:11 256:3 142:25 143:25 forgot 67:2 81:6 82:24 83:9 84:14 85:11,18, full-time 20:2,21 144:4 157:5,9 form 29:18 48:4 158:6,14 160:23, 23,24 86:19 99:1 167:21 49:3 50:9 51:25 25 161:6 168:18 102:2 103:6 **fully** 10:18,24 52:4 59:24 80:13 174:24 175:20,22 107:8,23 108:10 82:15 88:24 90:1 13:13 50:11 97:5 115:11 145:1 178:9 182:12 91:14 97:20 99:11 **future** 10:20 186:10,12,13,22 160:12 204:14 100:2 103:9 283:24 207:4 210:16 187:6,10,14,24 107:13,15 108:15, 189:23 191:10,21 217:8,11 219:3 19 109:23 113:2 194:16,22,25 223:11 231:1,20, G 115:21 116:9 21 236:22 237:6, 205:9 207:10,13, 121:18 127:11,25 18.24 209:1.24 18 238:8,25 240:9 gain 13:18 131:17 136:6 210:16 211:14 242:3,25 244:1,3, 139:24 143:21 gave 26:17 76:3,9 213:19,22 225:9, 5,6,12,15,18 153:13 191:6,13 81:7 82:23 95:17 245:12,18,20 23 226:24 230:5 192:2 193:3 280:20 283:16 258:6,12,18 247:14 248:8 205:11,13,14,15, 284:11 260:6,16 261:7 257:14,23 263:1, 16,25 206:3,4,17 **GEN.20318** 204:7 273:3 18 264:5 273:17 223:19 229:4 274:13 275:1 **GEN.20318.** 210:9 **Glinn's** 36:24 54:8 239:4,8 240:14,19 280:8 55:8 57:2 124:21 243:2 246:8,17 general 42:9 247:21 248:18 foundation 248:20 138:8 191:14 106:19 195:10 252:3 207:7 216:17 250:8,25 251:22 202:16,18,21,24 252:24 256:25 **fourth** 71:18 203:1,6,8,10,12 **good** 127:1 128:21 259:24 260:22 209:4 130:25 185:8 frame 15:11 256:1 261:17 262:12 218:11 219:25 257:3 258:3 generally 276:12 263:4 266:23 220:19 279:3 283:12 284:5 frequent 58:15,18, gosh 103:19 23 59:5,6 give 35:4 77:7 **formal** 180:20 **Gotcha** 67:20 93:10 124:24 183:25 frequently 42:10, 140:17 169:7 23 43:10 60:16 government 47:12 formalize 186:15 188:14 254:3 50:22 51:18 258:19



Page Dominique Delaghes 9, 2024 Index: government'simplementation			
52:18,21	handwritten	helping 11:3,5	honest 116:5
government's 49:9	201:18 218:10,12 hang 275:15	Herzog 18:11 94:17 95:1,11,16	honestly 95:13 167:17 169:25
granular 159:4,7 160:17	happen 54:15	96:23 97:10,15 98:5,19 99:9,25	honesty 45:10
graph 214:3	happened 28:19 29:2 42:23 43:10	103:3,23 117:18 123:16 124:5	hoped 208:9 hopeless 103:20
graphical 93:10 192:10 194:14	68:24 77:8 78:6 82:8,9 88:12,15, 16 102:25 106:22	154:12,19 246:1, 6,14,25 247:4,5	hour 60:20,21
205:12,15,17 206:1,4,17 209:11	141:4,9,13 159:9 163:15 183:17	Herzog's 123:22 hey 16:23 19:15	hours 15:10 16:17 92:16 94:4
great 50:6 guess 57:13 59:19	212:13 234:4,9 248:17 258:25	144:7 145:15,24 146:1 147:13	human 31:11 111:3 140:19,25
110:21 111:24	happy 18:15	232:6	hundred 57:6
203:9 268:15 269:9,25	hard 181:22 268:6	high 128:6 129:7	hurt 119:1
guidelines 268:3	hate 245:25	higher 132:25 135:14	hygiene 276:15
	he'll 177:17	highest 72:22	hypothetical 116:10 133:24
H	head 141:22 148:23 164:14	highlighted	142:17 251:2
hair 12:8 22:14,17 24:22 38:15 55:10,15,17 56:8	167:13 182:8 208:24 233:1,9 265:20,22	103:17 highly 250:9 hire 164:19	262:19
72:19,24 264:17 265:6 277:4,6	headed 175:9 243:19	hired 20:6 153:1, 17 155:5 207:11,	ice 254:1
half 141:17 165:6	heading 201:13	14,17,22	ID 202:22
hand 201:9 259:1 262:6	heads 143:12 281:8	hiring 207:25 historic 48:18	idea 77:7 90:16 91:11 142:8 240:17
handed 33:3 36:14 66:8 91:18 104:13 110:3 174:20	Health 31:11 111:3	53:10 historical 39:12,	identified 230:17 255:3
194:24 200:10,15 201:12 219:12	hear 119:9 121:13 217:18	20 40:2 42:2,23 43:1,7,17,22	identify 10:19 254:24
225:20 259:1 handing 66:5 75:25 76:1 103:21	heard 189:12 199:18 251:11 hearing 249:22	57:24 58:8,9 59:7, 9,14 60:11,14,16 65:10 71:15 72:4, 13 73:17 92:7,8,	ignoring 204:15, 21,24 205:5 206:7 213:5
124:18 150:15 175:8 219:8	Heet 6:4,18	14,15 272:3	illegal 76:17
226:18 254:6	held 6:16 36:10	hold 52:10 57:5,24	imagine 29:11
272:20	74:22 75:23 104:10 158:22	240:12	implement 185:17
handle 267:21,22	184:14 189:15,18	holding 180:10,11	implementation
handwriting 207:8	·	homestretch 229:21	62:15 221:19
	1	1	1



	Pagel Dominiq greet	Delagnes July 09, 2022	Index: implementinginten
implementing	including 69:3	53:3,4,24 54:11,	223:16 224:11,19
222:3 223:17	126:14 273:18	18,24 71:11 92:6	225:11 244:4,15,
224:20	incomplete	104:21 108:7,8,9	18 245:15 247:13
important 75:2	116:10 133:23	116:8 143:14	248:8 258:2,9,15
	142:16 216:3	145:3 149:3	259:9,22 263:19
impressed 122:14	251:1	155:3,12 168:3	275:11,12 278:7
impression		179:18 182:22	inspection-type
215:25	inconsistency	190:17 191:18	219:2
improper 59:8	26:2,9	214:5 226:2,17	
60:16 147:24	incorporated	258:24 278:1	inspections 102:3
	216:22	283:17	113:6 165:14
improperly 74:5	incorrect 99:15	informed 63:6	244:1,6,12 245:4
improve 25:1,15	225:5 231:24	83:18,19 195:6	254:23 257:9
194:1	232:3	infrequent 40:4	inspector 200:18
improved 102:14		-	202:12 204:4
improved 193:14, 25	incorrectly 269:11	Ingham 76:4	214:25 227:6
	incredibly 232:2	initially 166:12	235:16 278:2
improvement	independent	221:7	inspector's 209:9
24:21 59:13	79:18,25 80:9,18	initiated 125:10	211:1
254:25	194:5 195:22		inspectors 201:9
improvements	196:2 238:24	initiates 219:20,23	203:14,17 206:20
21:24 22:8	index 72:23	inquire 194:22	207:4 210:16
in-house 264:17	indicating 41:20	insisted 71:13	212:3 213:3 217:8
265:3,5	77:21	72:17 117:24	220:8 223:10
inaccurate 89:22		inspected 166:12	224:12
90:6,18,21 91:4	individual 140:15	216:9 264:4	instance 136:24
129:12 145:2	145:11 148:20		instances 40:16
174:1 198:3,24	169:17 171:2	inspection 87:20	41:2,18 58:13
inaccurately	201:3,6 203:10	102:7,15,22,24	69:2 140:18
26:24	271:19	149:4 153:3	141:20 144:20
	individual's	160:12 164:20,23	
inappropriate	170:19 171:3	165:3,20,23 166:2,3,7,8,13,15	instructed 265:16
249:12	individually	167:2,6 175:1,5	instrument 64:19
incidents 209:8	161:17 278:21	176:4,13,20	213:25 214:1
include 28:13		177:10 180:24	instruments 214:3
72:20 209:6	individuals 79:18	181:4 184:22	
210:12 211:4,5	80:9 95:12	193:16,17,19,20	insufficient 156:4
212:25	279:11,15,19,24	194:3 195:8,14,	integrate 208:8
	industry 57:23	20,23 196:5	integrity 45:11
included 41:19	58:3 135:10 255:4	197:5,13 201:7	
112:16 259:17	Info 177:24	202:4,5,8 204:14	intended 46:18
277:1	information 11:20	205:11 206:13	127:15 134:3
includes 12:14	12:17 15:9,12	207:5 213:14	139:3 254:25
38:19	27:11 34:5 37:15	219:17 220:1,6	274:21
	44:5,10 52:21	221:19 222:2,9	intent 223:21
	77.0, 10 02.21		
	1	1	NEVITAC



interaction 135:1 230:18 231:1 25 55:8 57:2 61:9. 156:19 232:2,15 238:24 24 63:23 64:5 interest 256:8 **July** 6:9 202:6 241:10,11 276:16 92:1 105:22,25 230:5 235:12,14 interested 105:10 106:2,22 111:23 243:11,25 244:21 Investigations 111:8 112:1 118:8 9:20 36:19 226:22 jumping 58:7 123:10 124:21.22. interference investment 23 125:9 133:5,8 **June** 56:9 225:16, 132:22 252:17 152:19 196:17 22 **interim** 165:3 273:2,9,10 **involved** 90:11,18 174:25 175:5 jury 91:5 246:3,15 **Jarrad** 103:23 involvement 176:4,20 180:24 jury's 246:21 126:7 189:11.13 181:3 184:22 **Justice** 46:1 47:6, 193:16,17,19,20 **Jason** 18:11 94:17 **issue** 70:7 71:4 11 48:13,22 49:16 194:3 202:4 103:23 123:16 128:18 130:13,19 50:7 54:5 114:22 246:1,6 internal 30:20 163:2 170:9,10 Justice's 48:1 171:15 209:21 32:16 33:8 34:1.9 jeopardize 268:21, 49:22 53:11 66:16,18 24 **issued** 99:10 167:4 215:21 278:16 **iob** 13:19 14:7,22 254:16 K 15:2,19 16:17 **issues** 26:14 interpret 57:14 17:25 18:2,25 49:16 69:18 77:13 keeping 98:18 129:5 19:15,16 20:1 79:20 83:8 127:5, 99:4 107:2,10,24 167:21 interpretation 22 128:25 129:10, 108:2 119:14 278:11 11 jog 33:11 **kind** 12:1 18:19 interrupt 184:8 item 92:12,18 join 123:19 26:11 59:18 159:2 182:3 186:1 167:6 194:18 introduce 6:22 **journal** 197:6 187:18 199:4 199:9 **Klette** 53:22 introduced 50:12 203:23 204:5 209:5 210:19 iudge 12:16 94:18 **Klette's** 52:25 investigate 68:3,9, 215:12 243:23 95:17 96:6,9,23 53:2 17 70:2,13,25 273:19 97:11,16 98:6,19, knew 20:20 75:8 investigated 25 99:7,23,24 items 37:6,9,12,20 21:16 50:11 221:7 76:12 78:6 80:8, 100:1,12 101:2 38:11 64:24,25 10 85:24 86:22 237:5 241:8 103:4,8 147:8 65:1,5,19 71:11 87:1 119:24 242:2,24 253:22 92:5 112:3 176:6, 120:14 206:2,18, investigating 8,11 177:7,8,17 **judges** 73:25 19,20 261:14,20 108:14 228:11 178:19 179:4 117:18 118:6 283:9 238:10 239:2 181:7,11 182:3 152:15 153:12 knowing 63:21 183:8 191:22 247:20 250:23 investigation 79:25 86:19 203:14 209:4 251:18 253:6 47:11 48:1 49:18, 142:7,10 23 50:14 80:18 judgment 173:14 knowledge 64:2 81:24 113:8,13,20 J 174:5 65:15 185:13,16 114:2,5,19 118:12 judicial 11:22 187:20 194:5 148:22 151:4 **J.C.** 6:25 117:4 262:3 155:9 190:25 knowledgeable **January** 21:3,10 226:5,11,14 judiciary 152:9 157:3,11 187:14, 44:19 45:7 54:8,



	Pagel Dominique	2Delagnes	July 09, 2024Index: lablive
16,19,24 188:2,3, 5	ladies 126:6 144:5 lady 9:3 144:21	Lena 33:5 36:18 91:20 189:22 219:13,25 225:23	lie 244:16 246:4,7, 15 lied 249:24
L	large 135:9 193:9 larger 137:24	length 148:9 255:23	life 271:22
lab 112:10 113:10, 11,18 138:1	LAS 15:11 law 6:17 171:4	letter 9:19 10:1,4, 9,10 12:24 17:10	lifted 234:11,13,14 235:22
150:20 164:20 175:10,15,23 178:4 179:5,22	199:9 lawful 7:9	23:15,18 25:10,19 26:10,15,18 27:3,	lifting 230:13 264:3
180:12,19,25 184:3 186:14 202:16,18,21,24	lawsuit 48:24 49:23,25 59:18 91:7 148:10 170:7	7,14,20 28:5 29:5 33:14,22 36:15,24 37:17 44:3,16,19, 23 45:7 53:5 54:8	lightly 135:20 limit 40:25 limited 12:20
203:1,6,7,10,12 209:4 211:16,25 212:4 216:1 275:8	279:16,19 280:18 lawyer 83:15	55:5,8 57:2 61:8, 14,15,20 62:1,13, 21,25 63:4,19,23	34:13 169:16 170:16,18 199:12 LIMS 208:9
lab's 215:18 labeled 126:20,22	lawyers 9:2 199:12 LC-MS/MS 133:13,	64:4 65:6,17 71:10 78:11,23,24 91:19,25 98:11,14	lines 39:1,10 126:19 274:14,19
135:12 156:6	19 134:14,15,22 157:18 192:24	145:23 154:13 189:21,24 191:23,	liquefied 271:14
laboratory 8:17 14:6 15:2 20:1 21:12 41:2 67:1,2, 6,7,9 68:14 69:11 74:22 87:19 107:5,19 114:11 115:5 152:14,19	215:19 216:18,21, 23,24 218:4,18 leadership 19:6 Leading 279:5,13, 25 learn 116:24	24 192:1 194:25 195:6 199:23 200:1,8,11 225:8, 21 226:1,19 227:2,17 228:21 229:1 230:3,10,12 231:16 232:12,13,	list 64:8 65:19 118:10 125:14,19 126:6,10 127:1 129:6 155:1 185:5 209:4 231:6 265:19 275:25
153:23 154:22 155:17,24 167:22 170:9 187:3 196:7 200:17 203:8,24 204:1 207:10,14	153:22 197:17 learned 15:7,9,14, 22 114:19,21 115:10 119:1	14,20 233:11 257:4 273:3 letterhead 9:20 33:4 36:16 91:20 94:17 225:21	listed 102:1 106:2 177:7 211:2,9,20 217:21 231:15 276:24 277:4
210:21 214:21 219:2 220:9,21, 22,24 227:18	145:18 199:14 learning 99:8 leave 15:7 57:17	226:20 letting 25:21	lists 112:3 176:5 188:11 196:12 211:5
231:1,2 255:4 258:25 267:22	69:17,20 194:15 201:3,7	Levey 213:20 Levey-jennings	litigate 59:22
276:16 laboratory's 211:3 lack 17:2 196:22 200:9	leaving 9:12 led 101:18 left 215:25	193:13 194:10 209:11 213:8,10, 21 Lexitas 6:20	litigation 126:20 143:9 167:23 170:3 282:20 283:16 284:9
lacks 248:19 252:2	legal 6:19 49:11 52:8,13 174:9 197:6 246:18	LGC 55:16 56:6 liable 116:25	live 50:21 110:18



	PagerB4:1435		e
98:20	M	222:3 232:7 234:2 241:25 256:23	marketplace
loading 145:19		274:8	,
location 277:14	M.D. 61:10 226:21	makes 130:14	Marshall 8:24
locked 278:3	230:6 Mack 172:25	making 81:21	mass 28:10 30:13 64:12 156:25
lodge 31:18 32:10, 20	174:4	108:12 123:19 149:22,23 183:3	match 216:3
lodging 35:24	macro 192:6,8	203:5 238:1 251:6	materials 54:4
long 13:8 48:22 60:18 93:24	193:8,10 made 25:1,15	253:21 260:6 261:9	matter 6:12 27:16 28:1 89:9,23
147:22,24 224:4	26:14 46:15 48:10,15 58:2,7,	maligning 13:4,9,	Matthew 143:1
229:16 256:15 273:16	10 59:6,11 61:16 63:8 65:22 77:12	16,23,25 14:13 management	Mayor-oliver 143:1
longer 72:3,13 looked 19:20 28:1	79:22 83:8 87:17 100:20,21 101:8	203:25 258:19,21 259:3 261:16 262:10	MDHHS 31:24 33:9 110:6,13
61:14 74:23 78:8 125:2 137:2 139:19 140:16,20	106:24 117:16 120:1,3,9 121:24 129:24 130:6	manipulation 40:6 43:1,2 64:19	111:6 114:10 115:2 117:2,17 155:6
143:19 145:1,17 177:1,2 182:23 185:6,11 281:3,9,	140:19 145:11 152:13 156:10 193:16 198:18	manipulations 43:3,5 manual 216:4	meaning 22:6 77:2 115:2 132:9 198:18 215:21
13 lose 88:13 120:17, 22	213:3 230:16 231:8 233:24 235:22 246:14 247:19,25 248:1,	March 110:6,13 111:20 166:19 174:24 175:5,6	means 68:22,24 119:12 129:10 227:17 229:9
lost 169:21 229:18 243:16 lot 49:14 96:17 142:14 157:2	12,24 250:15,21 251:18 253:5,6 262:13 264:19,20 276:8 279:23	178:2,6 179:23 186:7,14,18 189:22,25 190:16 259:3	meant 128:2,4,13 130:19 139:17 158:7 179:5 191:8 206:21 228:1,2
267:20 276:25	280:4,17 main 277:23	marijuana 25:2,4 132:9	229:1 274:18
Louis 67:9 197:6 199:3,6,10 200:12	maintain 148:19,	mark 214:21,22	measures 259:17, 18 260:19
Louisiana 167:22	25 271:11	marked 36:15	media 196:24
love 188:4	maintained 120:24 122:6	66:5,9 76:1 91:19	197:9 199:3,13 200:10 211:23
low 132:25 135:9	120:24 122:6	103:22 104:14 110:4 124:18	215:4 233:18
lower 32:5 40:25 102:23 163:1	maintains 255:15 major 40:15	150:15 174:20 175:8 194:24	medical 69:18 medications
lowest 41:1	124:15 268:7	201:12 204:7 214:19 219:8	132:24 135:8
lunch 117:11	make 16:10 20:12,	225:20 226:18	meet 156:5
lying 249:5 260:17	14 31:2 47:1 59:12 72:6,8 147:22 212:19	254:7 259:2 272:21	meeting 15:18 16:3 19:7,14



28:13 104:25 mic 163:6 254:4 Missouri 6:15 moving 205:15 105:2 177:9 208:3 MICH 32:4 111:1 misspeak 163:16 181:13 183:13,15 mud 46:15 Michael 61:10 misstates 251:25 meetings 12:14 230:5 Multiquant 157:6, **mistake** 145:11 17:17 16 158:4 Michele 61:9 67:5 mistakes 10:19 member 19:6 159:6 97:6 Ν memo 33:4 94:16, Michelle 9:23 model 215:23 24 95:8,11 96:16 Michigan 31:11 names 30:17 89:3, 97:10 98:14 **molecule** 135:10 73:25 74:1 75:12, 4 266:3,6 280:20 99:17.24 100:12 molecules 132:25 20 76:4 81:10 103:4,6 144:5,21 needed 37:15 65:2 85:11 88:20 89:7 moment 47:5 182:4,18 191:18 memoranda 83:14 94:19 96:24 184:8 275:16 192:12,23 193:13, 100:23 104:15,22 memorandum 25 204:20 265:16 monetary 51:19, 111:2 114:13.14 83:16 277:9 284:12 24 115:10 117:16,18 **memory** 125:4 negative 71:21 136:1,3,12,18,19 money 48:23 memos 30:20 72:8 82:19 85:7 137:22 139:7,22 49:14,24,25 117:17 93:17,20 132:21 145:14,16 150:22 119:13 133:2,22 134:14, 153:2,5,17,18 mention 22:6 monitor 16:10,19 15,20,23 135:2,3 162:10,25 198:3, 25:12,14 75:14,19 17:9,13 221:14 162:15 185:8 24 273:4,24 78:3 80:20 81:11 223:15 224:18 84:13 85:18 87:5 negatives 72:10 Microsoft 66:18 monitored 17:22 95:22 96:6 101:1 **neutral** 185:9 middle 114:16 103:8,12,13 **month** 111:19 Mike 203:22 **news** 254:10,18 106:15,21 112:4 153:10,22 168:11 113:8,12 114:4 178:22 Nichole 66:22.24 million 47:12 48:2, 139:21 151:3 67:18 25 49:8 114:15 months 7:24 21:3, 241:7 277:14 141:21 9 97:16 98:6 99:3. Nick 7:2 34:18 mentioned 47:5,6 9 213:25 255:19, 173:19 188:16 mind 268:9 23,25 256:10 114:2 117:19 258:8 minor 89:9,12,23, 157:16 210:1 morning 117:15, noncompliance 24 90:11,19 91:13 268:12,20 278:19 22 219:25 220:19 196:11 220:13 minus 72:23 mentions 22:7 221:25 223:11 morphine 22:14, minute 82:4 224:13 menu 277:5.7.9 16 124:24 125:3 nondomestic message 66:11,13 **mother** 76:15 166:23 171:13.18.22 67:18 **motion** 76:15 **minutes** 28:13 nonresponsive metabolite 25:4 60:22 148:1 move 32:25 59:1 74:16 70:21 150:11 74:11,14 122:20 nonroutine 165:22 **method** 24:21 181:23 205:17 **Miranda** 53:5,15 167:2 195:8 202:5 25:1,15 28:11 249:2 misloaded 145:12 207:5 214:13 methods 101:9 moved 281:17 219:17 missing 277:8 209:12 215:20



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Pagel Dominigus Delagnes

July 09, 2024Index: notary..order notary 6:5 247:24 248:11.16 objecting 107:15 offense 249:21 249:22,23 250:1, 250:7,13,24 notation 209:10 objection 27:22 21 251:17 259:7 251:13,20 252:14 31:15,19 32:11,21 notations 204:10 273:16 49:10 59:20 75:7 offer 11:25 note 211:1 numbered 189:25 84:21 86:21 89:15 office 8:20,23 109:19 112:20 noted 215:5 **numbers** 202:23 officer 7:20,22,24 113:14,21 120:11 210:8 notes 175:18 8:1,6 12:16 77:2 121:15 122:1,15, 176:3 180:25 211:17 212:1 numeric 129:8 18 128:11 129:14 201:19 202:4 132:15 133:23 offices 6:17 numerical 205:12 219:2 134:24 142:16 209:11 official 211:3 147:23,24 151:9 **notice** 62:5,9 numerically 152:1,23 155:18 officials 30:21 notification 211:3 127:4,21 128:24 156:13 163:23 74:1 notified 234:5 numerous 250:1 164:8 179:24 on-site 20:2 153:2, 199:25 249:2 **notify** 26:25 3 205:11 253:7 260:11 211:19,24 276:15 0 **ongoing** 226:12 objections 90:13 November 9:23 oath 251:16 98:10 153:24 onsite 16:2 10:5 21:22 24:19 239:13 25:11,24 27:7,14 open 9:13 116:5 **object** 29:18 48:4 28:6 37:2,3,4 42:7 120:18 49:3 50:9 51:22, obligated 45:23 63:6,7,16 96:10, 46:5 47:1 25 52:4 59:24 open-ended 148:2 23 99:18 100:1,12 80:13 82:15 88:24 observation 128:5 operating 7:20,22 101:2,11 102:6,9 90:1 91:14 97:20 129:6 8:6 77:2 211:16 103:4 105:22 99:11 100:2 212:1 217:4 218:4 obtain 41:2 196:16 231:10,12 102:10 103:9 274:11,24 276:22 107:13 108:15,19 obtained 30:20 number 6:13 109:23 113:2 opinion 42:24 15:20 20:24 21:5. 169:12 115:18,21 116:9 45:23 46:6 87:3,4, 6 22:16 24:16 occasion 103:5 121:18 127:11,25 10 29:22 31:7.18 131:17 136:5 occupation 7:17, 32:4 34:22 35:4,5 **opinions** 189:14 138:6 139:24 18 8:11 41:13 47:23 55:9 opportunity 147:2 143:21 153:13 66:6 92:18 93:4 occur 68:15 174:8 178:23 157:22 224:4 103:25 111:1 occurred 68:13 179:8 192:25 140:17 141:16,24 opposing 168:22 195:14,20,23 193:3 206:9 156:3 159:10 169:1 223:19 229:4 174:22 175:11 occurrences opposite 18:19 239:4,8 240:14,19 180:13 183:1,5 10:20 19:1.5 243:2 246:8,17 184:3 189:23 **October** 18:12 247:21 248:18 oral 12:8 72:19 196:20,22 197:3, 231:9 250:8,25 251:22 132:2,8 136:3,19, 15,18 198:22 252:23 256:25 off-cycle 164:23 22,23 137:7,21 200:9,21 201:25 259:24 260:22 139:7,22 277:4,7 210:4,8 219:21 off-year 166:11 261:17 262:12 222:7 227:1 order 174:12 **off-years** 165:13 263:2,4 279:5,13, 228:19 229:14 260:19 272:25 166:2 25 283:12 284:5 231:15 243:16



Page: 97 of 111

ordered 55:16 Padilla 133:10 parties 6:22 30:19 13.22 106:14.16 188:22 141:16,17 142:12 organization **Padilla's** 134:17 156:5 198:2,23 18:21 19:4 48:9 partner 269:10,23 pages 29:13,15,22 148:24 172:21 percentage 133:1 30:12 183:2 201:6 Partners 252:16 135:14 137:25 207:1,8 262:7,23 original 29:4 partnership 50:24 211:21 263:12 275:25 **perform** 165:15,17 269:25 166:1 originally 131:24 **paper** 97:23 parts 50:25 160:17 270:19,23 performance papers 52:20 **pass** 123:17 69:20 210:12 originals 29:23 53:24 266:1 past 92:16 213:9, out-and-out 246:4 paragraph 10:17 11 266:25 performed 38:14 11:2,10,11,12 outbrief 220:3,5,8 55:10 164:22 Pathologists 9:22 12:25 13:3,4,6,8,9 165:16 194:3 **outline** 108:23 33:5 36:17 53:13 21:21 22:5 24:25 227:13 228:4 109:4 61:8 69:5 80:25 37:17 40:6 45:6 277:5 280:5 200:17 201:14 54:9 57:22 62:14 **outlined** 15:17,19 225:22 226:20 period 255:17,18, 157:17 199:4 53:8 63:10,13 227:5 230:4 235:12 22 256:3,9 271:11 118:20 123:8 159:4 182:7 patient 40:8 perplexing 44:24 paragraphs 35:3 211:21 235:5 236:18 259:8 **person** 119:10 237:9 patients 21:14 parameters 157:7 157:5 177:12 overbroad 97:23 187:25 188:16 **pattern** 196:21 Parks 103:24 116:10 151:9 245:23 281:14 197:19 222:13 110:24 152:24 156:13 231:17 **person's** 172:3 163:23 164:9 part 20:15 30:17 pay 47:11 48:2,23 247:22 253:8 51:4,8,13,15 personal 45:11 204:22 59:12 81:24 97:25 238:22 overcome 11:5, 105:5 115:15 paying 205:5 18,23 personally 8:18 133:17,19 134:10, **Peat** 203:20 oversight 20:15, personnel 154:8 12 136:6 143:2 204:14 206:2 19 282:6,12 165:8,9,12,24 220:2,12 176:22 180:21 owns 252:17 pertinent 228:15 183:7,12,14 **pending** 103:16 **Phd** 9:24 61:10 224:2,7 241:10 173:8 211:12 P 230:6 258:23 212:14 **Philadelphia** part-time 19:22 **people** 11:17,25 **P-E-A-T** 203:21,22 173:3 20:7 18:2 26:7 109:8 **p.m.** 25:24 117:13 philosophy 99:5 111:8 116:15.18 participate 12:17 158:20 184:12 107:3,10,25 108:3 140:19 280:20 105:7 220:9 229:23 230:1 283:25 **phone** 269:14 participated 105:2 packages 282:20 percent 41:12 phonetic 143:1 283:16 284:10 participates 12:12 45:20 48:16 57:6, **phrase** 137:10 packets 143:9 11,15,16 77:22 participation 138:6,7,8 81:18,22 100:10, 12:19 packs 126:15 14,18,24 101:4,6,



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 99 of 111

Page: Dominique/Delagnes July 09, 2024Index: picked..probation

	Pagel Dominique	7 Delagnes July 09, 2	024Index: pickedprobatior
picked 128:6	41:12 71:20 72:5,	240:10 241:8	president 94:18
picture 159:9	6,9,12 93:16,19	242:3,25 243:1	250:3
_	185:21 186:16	264:5,6	pretty 13:8 19:1
piece 97:23	210:21 211:4,15	possibly 30:2,4	127:1 128:21
place 92:24 220:2	212:24		162:22 186:9
267:4	poor 25:7,17 40:7	practice 39:24 40:17,21 92:24	246:1 284:25
placing 65:7 71:10	poorly 248:3,6,7	,	285:4
	257:13	practices 38:20	prevent 10:20
plaintiffs 6:2,24		39:4,11 41:8	
7:1,10 28:19	pop 163:7	43:15 50:23 51:5,	preventative
272:7 280:6 282:14	Portillo 33:6 34:22	7,10,16,21 52:19,	209:7
	35:1 36:18 37:5,8	22 53:8,12 57:23	previous 212:13
plaintiffs' 280:17	38:18 40:16 44:20	58:3 65:11 83:21	258:25
plan 71:23 93:7,8	91:20 189:22,24	108:13,23 109:1,	previously 138:1
276:15	219:13 220:18	6,9,12,13,17 170:11,13 249:7	154:16 251:5
nlanning 165:00	224:10 225:23	·	272:21
planning 165:23 167:7	226:1	preceding 223:5	
	portion 50:5 207:1	267:18	primary 278:4
played 115:15	pos 71:3,7	preclude 160:24	principle 45:15
Pleban 6:25 34:24		161:23	principles 45:9
36:3,6 60:20	position 51:12	prefix 32:4,5 111:1	printing 6:6
75:22 85:6 94:2,5,	positive 71:8,21		-
9 158:18 171:12,	76:17,20 93:16,20	prematurely 270:20	prior 236:11
25 173:17 254:3	131:21 132:19		251:25
plenty 69:2	133:1,11,16	prep 26:2,9	proactively 234:5
plot 214:3	134:13,18 135:14	preparation	probation 11:21
•	137:9 138:2,7	200:25	12:16 61:21 62:6,
plots 209:11	139:4 144:10,14,	prepared 150:21	11 63:18 65:7
plural 182:19	20 162:14 185:8	175:20,22 176:16	67:15 69:5 71:10
point 24:11,21	196:21,24 197:20 220:15 222:15	179:6 180:21	73:20 74:19 75:3,
37:20 39:20 40:16	220.15 222.15	187:9	6,16 76:13 87:6
71:18 73:4 77:17	236:16,17 241:17		95:24,25 96:3
94:6 126:9 163:2	248:7	preparing 35:19 165:22 185:2	106:23 107:8,23
172:16 242:8,12,		192:6	108:10 111:23
16,23 271:20	positives 72:7,9	192.0	112:5 115:11
274:8 278:20	132:2,9 134:9	present 186:22	117:20 118:8
points 26:14 41:13	137:4,20,23	187:6	119:2 120:18
62:25 63:1 78:8	138:9,13,14,21, 22,25 139:6,8,18	presentation	121:4 123:10
237:23 242:22	142:9 144:4,8,9	110:18	124:3 151:4 165:7
254:20 259:18	145:3,7 148:17	nresentations	167:3,7 196:5,17
	150:3 162:7 223:9	presentations 117:15	220:25 221:13
policies 41:8	232:11,18 236:4,		223:14 224:17
47:15 62:16	5,22 237:6,7,19	presented 181:10,	230:13 232:25
policy 38:8,19	238:9,11 239:1	11 183:8 205:12	233:16 234:11,22
39:7 40:17,22,25		220:24 283:24	235:7,15,22



Page: 100 of 111 July 09, 2024Index: probationary..QC Filed: 08/08/24 Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29

Page Dominique Delagnes 236:24 243:10.25 35:23 49:20 54:3, **prove** 32:12 published 199:9 264:2,3 4 89:4 149:20 234:1 **proved** 106:9 218:15 284:25 probationary **pulled** 35:8,13 provide 11:15 255:17,18,22 producing 22:23 135:12 143:9 12:3,17 17:20 256:9 270:21,25 271:13 profession 45:10, 21:14 26:13,19,22 281:14 **problem** 26:1 36:1 12 27:1 71:13 72:12 **pulling** 143:14 121:24 122:3 problems 25:21 proficiency 14:8 124:12 155:1,3 69:22 37:21 38:4,14 **purely** 49:23 160:12 168:2,5,21 55:15,17 56:6,9 procedure 217:4 purpose 221:13, 170:4 205:8 234:3 65:9 66:2 69:4.7 218:5 277:13 18 222:2 223:13. 254:20 258:24 72:18 73:13 93:6 15 224:17 265:8 278:1 procedures 28:11, 191:1 204:6,16 21 30:14 50:16 purposefully 205:2 206:14 provided 15:17 127:2 62:16 64:16 84:14 213:6 18:5 26:17 27:11 85:12 92:14.20 52:20 93:11,18 purposes 208:9 program 55:17 108:23 109:4,15 104:21 110:12 110:5 192:24 pursue 48:14,19 131:13 140:21 122:2 125:19,25 195:3 200:17 50:18 51:20 154:9 188:22 126:1 155:10,12 203:25 208:10,16 212:20 232:5 165:11 168:18,24 **pursued** 49:17 209:5,21 227:6. 238:7,23 240:8 169:10,13 170:6, 13,22 228:12 **put** 31:14 33:15 267:24 273:19 25 172:8,9 177:15 35:15 95:1 101:17 274:11,24 276:22 Programs 36:20 226:16 254:17 105:3,5 107:8,23 201:15 226:23 282:3 proceed 7:6 108:10 115:10 **progress** 221:15 provider 12:15 118:7 121:4 proceeded 172:15 223:15 224:18 123:10 180:5 providers 21:14 proceeding 88:14, 230:17 235:17,23 192:10 196:17 18 89:21,23 providing 11:19 222:19 225:19 project 208:8 12:20 30:2 191:17 process 12:12 232:25 233:16 promoted 7:24 281:25 283:11,15 50:16 59:13 159:4 235:4 245:21 proper 60:8 283:9 208:10,16 216:20 281:13 282:20 **PT** 38:14 55:9.10 284:2 231:24 235:5 190:22 207:13 putting 87:6 105:7 241:11 268:4 209:15 210:11 properly 68:3,9,17 106:22 138:15 213:10,15 70:2,12,25 105:15 143:2 193:8 processes 43:13 50:14 51:1,3 265:17 282:15,24 **PTS** 209:17 79:19 140:22 Q proposed 22:14 **public** 6:5 73:22 209:6 212:19 107:22 233:18 prosecutor 83:16 232:8 267:4,6,8 **QC** 22:13,16 249:6,24 250:2,22 prosecutor's 39:12,16 40:17 processing 251:18 253:5,23 104:15,22 111:17 57:24 65:11 265:10 publication 112:4 71:20.24 93:15.17 produce 220:7 199:11 200:13 175:10,16,23 prosecutors 284:19,23 285:5 233:19 178:4 179:6,23 105:10 107:7,21 produced 7:9 180:20,25 184:3 publicly 100:21 108:17 109:21



186:14 192:9,23

208:8 209:13,21

117:16 118:7

233:17

28:18,25 31:5,9,

16,25 32:1,6,9,11

Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 101 of 111 July 09, 2024Index: QCS..receive

		Pagerby#!"41505	gbelagnes July 0.	e, 2024ilidex. QCGleceive
	272:3	82:17 84:6 90:8	quickly 27:16 28:2	285:8
	QCS 39:13,20 40:2	91:7 98:1,4,24	284:25 285:4	reading 83:16
	42:2,23 43:1,7,17,	102:20 103:15	quote 34:22 35:1	95:3,8 190:5,9
	22 48:18 58:8,9	107:6,20 108:2,4	79:7,8 126:20	193:18 202:22
	59:7,10,14 60:11,	113:25 115:9	,	212:11 241:5
	14,16 72:4,13	116:13 118:19	quotes 34:6 35:7,	243:13
	73:17 178:12	120:21 121:11	9,13,15 83:18	
	193:9 270:25	124:8,14 130:16	quoting 83:17	reagent 135:4,16
	271:1 272:1	131:25 134:3,5		276:25
		136:6,19 137:16,		real 158:19 159:19
	QM 209:5,21	19 138:16 139:16		realized 270:24
	qualitative 72:21	146:13,24 147:2,	raise 102:16	
	quality 14:7 15:21	12 148:3,12,21	raised 22:19 25:12	reanalyze 232:4
	16:15 21:13 38:19	158:6,9,10 163:25		reason 51:20
	39:16 40:22 59:13	170:22 179:16	44:25 83:19 152:8	105:9 115:20,22
	64:12,22 71:16,	180:17 183:19	156:19	116:18 136:2
	20,22 77:12 79:20	191:4 192:4	rare 58:13,14,16,	154:5 222:7 228:9
	83:8 92:8,14	194:16,20 196:1	21 59:5,6 142:11	230:15 235:21
	118:1 156:3	200:4 211:11	rarely 39:22,23	237:17 238:11,14,
	194:15 203:25	212:14 217:17,18,	40:3 141:10,11	15,24 239:6,16,
	205:9 214:2	23 218:1 222:20,		17,18 260:17
	215:19 216:19,23,	23 223:1,4,5,20 229:7 234:15	rated 72:24	281:19 282:8,16
	24 218:4,18		rating 72:22	283:4
	236:10 267:23,24	238:15 239:12,16 243:5 245:7		reasonable
	·	248:10 249:16,17,	re- 140:1	188:15,21
	quantify 88:11	18,19 250:5,18	re-qc'd 271:24	·
	quantitation 205:1	251:8,10,11	re-report 232:5	reasons 48:19
	215:20	252:2,24 256:4,13	•	120:9 121:24
	quantitative 38:10	260:24 261:6	re-reported 271:2	122:4 264:3 267:2,14
	93:5 204:5,16	263:9 264:22,24	re-resulted 141:23	,
	206:14 209:14	274:5 282:2,11,24	re-reviewed	recall 10:6 24:16
	213:5	283:24	143:10	33:23 34:11 75:18 96:16 104:9 105:3
	quantity 38:10	questionable	reach 234:2	110:19,21 125:7,
	131:6 255:2	56:14,22 72:24	reached 86:16	17 151:18,21,22
	quarter 208:11,15	questions 7:12		164:18 165:19
	question 9:2 17:4,	10:12 17:20 20:24	read 56:24 75:12,	166:21 167:17
	5,9,21 21:2,8,18	27:9 30:10 95:6	17 87:3,4 89:3	183:10,12 185:1
	22:1,12 24:1,2	157:2 188:7	94:25 95:4,16	186:20 187:2
	25:11,25 26:6,20	254:18 272:15,16,	98:2,4 104:5	190:6,9 192:13,19
	28:22 31:19 33:1	19 273:16 274:1	124:24 128:5	193:12 195:16
	42:19 46:3,4,13,	278:15 280:13,15	179:19 190:7	197:8 203:18
	21 51:14 56:25	285:7	193:17,19 194:8	207:24 247:9,15
	58:4 59:2 60:17	aujak 159:10	212:7 216:14	255:13 279:7
	63:24 74:8,16	quick 158:19	223:4,6 225:9	receive 62:2
	78:19,21 81:4,19	159:20	242:16 244:11,13	176:15,17,19
	70.10,2101.4,10		267:16,18 275:22	110.10,11,10
- 1				



Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Pagel Dominique Delagnes Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Page: 102 of 111 July 09, 2024Index: received..report

received 21:12	recording 209:6	125:4	relevant 35:25
31:10,24 32:3	records 169:17,24	regard 65:9,21,24	reliability 280:10
33:8,9 50:8 111:2 142:2 190:10	265:19,24 277:25	66:1 77:5 157:15	rely 158:6,14
199:23 200:6	278:3	213:9	remediate 260:20
220:22 227:8	recovered 41:4	regression 43:6,	
228:16	recovery 25:1,6,	12 44:1 48:17 53:11 215:23	remediated 259:13
reclaim 11:4,13	16 215:22		remediation
recognize 31:17	redacted 89:5	regular 165:12,14 168:10 170:5	259:17,18
125:1	refer 12:4 83:3,5	244:1,6,12,15,18	remedy 259:18
recognized 31:6	106:19	245:3,14 247:13	
recollect 255:10	reference 162:6,9	248:8	remember 29:21 96:19 182:8
recollection 31:2	221:8 227:25	regularly 169:5	183:14,15,16,17,
33:11 95:9 141:19	228:18 229:14	regulators 251:19	18,20,21 190:11
195:22 196:2	referenced 53:23	253:6,23 254:24	264:23 273:20
247:1	references 29:14	regulatory 165:24	278:17 280:19
recommendation	referred 83:7	241:14	remotely 183:11
182:15 193:15 217:19	113:10 165:2	reinjected 271:13	removal 243:10,24
	186:23 190:22 199:4 200:8	rejected 236:3	removed 220:25
recommendations 177:4 183:24	201:19 202:3	rejection 277:19	235:15
185:18 276:6,8	245:15 260:8,18	relate 118:1,2,13	repeat 10:15 97:25
recommended	261:7	121:7 123:11	134:5 217:23
21:23 22:7	referring 52:25	180:23	repeated 196:21
recommends	54:2 78:24 80:3,7,	related 156:24	197:19 231:16
182:25	16 83:14 84:11 98:14 99:17,23,25	196:23 198:11	repeatedly 117:23
record 6:9 15:14	100:4,7 106:11	200:10 202:16	119:7
29:12 30:6 36:9,	115:6 133:14	209:17 228:14 278:10	repeating 222:13
11,13 61:2,5	136:2 149:11	relates 106:4	rephrase 63:25
75:24 81:16 89:6 94:11,14 104:11	162:18 183:4 185:23 192:1,16	134:9 197:14	237:13 249:19 279:6 282:11
117:8,10,13	203:4 205:19	214:18 215:9	
143:18 158:18,21,	207:19 210:3	218:25 219:2	report 12:8 17:14 53:1,2 56:6,19
23,25 159:2,15	267:9	230:21	66:11,15 68:4,18
168:11 184:11,13, 15,18 189:16,19	refers 28:9 162:13	release 16:23	70:3,11 71:1
199:3,6 200:12	176:4 181:3	released 71:21	98:22 139:6,8,23
201:25 219:21	191:21 210:20	72:7 93:17	140:2,10,15,16,22 142:1,2 143:16
227:1 229:23	reflect 280:24	270:20,23,24	144:9,18 145:4
230:1 233:7 248:14 251:12	reflected 183:8	releases 236:16	150:17,21 151:4
259:6 275:9,14	reflecting 78:12	releasing 196:21	152:6 153:21
277:22 285:11	refresh 31:2 95:9	197:19 222:15 231:17 236:11	154:3 156:11,17 157:18 158:12
		231.17 230.11	137.10 130.12



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 103 of 111

Ju	30. 4.22 0V 00070 OFF	Pagel Dominique	Delagnes July 09, 2	2024Index: reportedresult
	159:18 161:4	18:19 19:1,5	231:3 280:5	129:12 130:5,10,
	162:5 175:1,5	reprimanded 17:6,	respond 90:25	15 131:8,15,23
	180:20 181:18		138:12,18 147:15,	140:20,21 141:3
	183:25 184:3	23 18:3,8		145:16,20 148:20
	185:9,12,14	reputation 116:8	16,23 149:14,17	270:24,25
	186:11 187:8,24	request 31:10,23,	209:25 225:2	,
	189:4 193:20	24 32:2,7 145:16	responded 15:13	result's 141:5
	199:15 200:18,19,	149:7,9,23 168:13	22:12	resulted 140:25
	20 201:7,9 206:13	188:13 191:17	reenending 01:20	requite 11:2 16 10
	214:12 215:4		responding 81:20	results 11:3,16,19
	258:2,9,15 260:1,	192:18	response 10:10	12:8,21 16:23
	3,13 261:24	requested 27:12	17:8 31:22 32:2	22:14,17,23
	262:2,8,22 263:12	91:22 92:1 192:17	36:23 44:17 53:25	23:20,23,24 24:8
	271:17 275:8,12	283:1	54:18,24 59:15	37:22 38:5,10
	211.11 213.0,12		69:25 70:10 72:2.	41:3 45:19 47:17
	reported 14:17	requests 170:4	11 73:7 92:19	48:16 49:17,21
	16:9 26:24 41:3	require 150:1	93:4,12 124:22	50:15 52:21
	67:21 74:6 106:24	189:3,5	191:17,24 201:15,	55:15,18 56:9,14,
	131:8 133:11,21	required 93:16	22 204:8 205:9,21	23 64:22 65:10
	134:14,19,20,22	156:5 225:9	207:2 208:21	66:2 70:19 71:21
	135:2 139:10	130.3 223.9	210:9 211:8,13	72:21 74:6,7
	141:6,7 144:10,19	requirement	216:13,18 217:1	76:16,21 77:22
	145:12 162:14,15	165:25 166:9	218:7 220:18	78:1 81:17,22
	199:18 232:3	210:8,20 214:19	221:23 223:7,9	83:2 87:20 88:4,7
	270:21	215:13 217:5	225:13 226:16	90:6,17 91:1
	roportor 7:5 52:10	225:17 258:23	238:2 254:9	93:16 96:20 98:23
	reporter 7:5 52:10 222:24 223:2	requirements		99:14 100:8,14,
	ZZZ.Z4 ZZJ.Z	165:13 166:1	responses 40:7	18,24 101:13
	reporter's 6:17	196:6 276:15	207:3 220:22	102:2 105:11
	reporting 40:25		225:10	106:14 108:1
	70:6,18,20 71:2	requires 71:20	responsibilities	112:12,24 119:8,
	131:14 215:15	reran 145:20	14:2 16:11,18	24 120:15 125:19,
	216:2,21 220:14		18:25 19:16	25 127:3,9,21
	225:1	reread 140:2		128:17,24 129:7,
		222:22	responsibility 17:15 241:13	18 130:9,11
	reports 126:11	research 148:18	17:15 241:13	131:3,12,15
	141:15 177:21	reserve 188:13	responsible	132:12 139:11
	189:7 270:11		215:2,4	140:11,17,23
	278:16 279:23	reserved 6:7	responsive 82:6,7	142:7,22 144:8,18
	represent 6:22	resigned 17:11,18	rest 74:15 160:9	153:4 169:5 191:1 196:22,24 197:20
	representation	resolve 27:7,10,20	restart 59:2	204:5,6,16 205:1,
	93:11 192:10	resolved 21:17	restart 59.2	12 206:14 207:13
	194:14 205:18		restate 134:1,7	209:14 210:11,14
	206:1 233:12	resolving 27:15	result 14:8 26:23	213:5,6,15 214:2
	representing 6:24	28:1	38:10 56:15,22	215:12,14,15
		respect 188:25	68:22,23 72:24	216:21 220:15
	reprimand 14:19	189:14 207:12	75:14 88:14 99:21	222:15 225:1
		I	I	I



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 104 of 111

u	30. 4.22 0V 00070 OFFE	Pagel Dominique	Delagnes July 09), 2024Index: retainsection
	231:17,25 232:4,6	30:1 178:12	198:1,23 221:10	schedule 154:24
	236:11,17 237:24	283:20,25	228:23 229:2,10	Schwilke 164:20
	238:6 241:17	reviews 14:8	230:22	165:3,15,21
	265:8 267:3	15:16 16:15	role 13:13 15:23	166:4,17 167:10
	270:22 271:2	258:19,22	20:2,13	168:20 174:23
	279:4,8 280:7	·	·	176:5 177:9
	281:12 282:13	revise 72:5	root 10:19 65:9	178:19 180:21
	283:18,20 284:11	revised 71:20	66:1 68:3,9,11,16,	184:23 187:9,23
	retain 29:6,23	93:15 217:13 218:3	18,21 69:3,6 70:2, 25 184:4	192:6,22 193:2,12
	retaining 29:9		routine 166:2,15	207:19,21
	retention 215:21	RFP 149:13,16,21 150:1	RPR 6:4	Schwilke's 172:4 176:20
	retest 162:14	Richmond 8:21,25	rules 150:1	science 137:15
	retract 145:4	Rick 6:23 31:6	188:20,25 189:14	scientific 49:20
	retrained 265:13,	102:17 146:2,5,7,	ruling 87:17	52:20 53:24 58:4
	15	9 149:21 249:8,14	run 57:25 156:4	204:9 209:10
	reveal 120:2	Rick's 163:12	167:16	237:24
	review 14:8 20:8	Riley 13:3,10	runs 40:7 205:10	scientifically
	41:14 54:11 64:22	14:16 15:18 16:9		52:23 267:5
	95:14 125:18,20,	19:15,21 20:20	S	scientist 53:21
	21 126:7,12	22:6,11,20 23:19		270:23
	175:10,16,23	25:14,20 26:8	sample 40:8 133:9	scientists 236:10
	176:24 177:3 178:5 179:6,23	42:16 43:21 44:25 45:8 46:25 48:14	267:22	screen 133:1,13
	180:20 181:1	50:12 58:24,25	samples 12:8	134:10,20 135:14
	186:14 192:23	59:5 61:17 63:8	38:15 55:11 57:10	138:22,25 139:4,9
	193:13 213:9	75:5,8 76:7 77:21	268:16	144:14
	220:24 245:23	81:16 94:19 95:17	sanction 262:4	
	246:2 259:3,23	96:12 99:20		screened 135:1
	261:16 262:10	100:13,17 101:17	Sarah 44:25 50:12	138:1
	275:18 278:20,23	117:24 118:9	94:19	screening 135:5
	280:16,19,25	151:24 152:21	sat 183:11	219:3
	281:21,22,24	155:15 156:1	satisfaction 48:25	screens 132:19
	282:3,5,9 283:8,	197:23 198:11,20	49:8	scroll 276:23
	17 284:1	228:17 231:8	satisfactorily	
	reviewed 87:13	Riley's 20:12	259:13	search 265:24 266:15
	105:8 143:13	24:14,19 42:4,22		
	176:12 178:15	64:3 73:10,21	satisfactory	Second-amended
	185:4 208:4	74:20 78:7 79:1	57:11,12,15 69:22	32:15,19 34:12,
	215:14 220:23	80:1,11 81:1,6,13	satisfied 50:7	20,21
	227:6,12 279:19	82:11 87:7 97:12	51:24	section 42:3
	280:8 281:11,15 282:10,12,17,23	99:1 106:12 107:9 108:11 112:6	satisfy 51:18	156:20 157:17
		115:11 123:9	Saturday 21:22	158:7,11 159:5,
	reviewing 29:16			15,18 160:8,10



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 105 of 111

Jase. 4.22-07-00676-5HL	. Doc. #. 106-29 F Pagel Do mi nigge	BDelagnes July 09,	. 105 01 111 2024Index: sectionssound
161:3 162:5,6 201:5 202:20 203:1,7,10,12 215:10,19,24 sections 203:4 secured 277:24 278:1,4 security 277:24 278:5 segregated 277:23 select 215:22 selected 125:20 126:2 selection 125:24	pagel Dominages set 62:21,24 64:25 157:8 159:18 161:4 162:5 232:12 271:16,18 272:10 273:18 278:13 sets 39:12 setting 207:15 settings 12:11,18, 20 settle 48:10 60:6 settled 47:10,23, 24,25 50:3 173:9 settlement 50:6 settling 59:18	shortly 188:10 show 16:22 31:1 33:17 37:21 41:17 50:15 87:20 140:19 147:8 233:10 242:10,12 258:11,12 262:14 278:2 showed 15:18 49:18 52:22 74:24 154:15 184:24 197:4,9 199:16 228:9 262:9 shown 38:9 91:1 93:5 273:22 shows 17:2 56:13	sit 163:18,19 187:17 249:21 268:6 site 15:8 67:7 80:18 125:21 126:22 150:21 151:18,19,23 153:17,19 154:10, 13 155:4,8,13 177:13,15,16 178:20 183:10,12 197:5 199:16 201:7,10 211:15 212:3 215:5 277:2 sitting 31:17 275:19 situation 147:25
self-inspection 164:24 165:1,15, 16 166:3,5,13,14, 16,17 167:4 self-inspections 165:18 self-report 10:18 97:6 send 44:4,9 103:5 126:21 149:13,16, 21 179:18 sentence 19:19 24:24 27:14 43:5, 10 67:25 155:24 223:23,24 244:17, 20,22,25 245:2,8 248:3 255:1 257:7,14,16,17 274:5,6,16,18,23 276:14 sentiment 240:17 September 16:5 28:12	Shannon 125:11 161:16 share 95:11 shared 220:11 257:3 she'd 187:19 she'll 157:20 172:6 222:17 sheet 126:1 201:15 207:2 208:21 216:18 sheets 201:3 218:7 225:13 shield 262:17 shifts 215:20 shipped 29:5,6 shocked 247:24 248:11,16 250:21 251:17 short 61:3 66:11, 13 94:12 184:16 229:24 271:15	90:6 105:21 214:4 237:23 sic 72:21 75:6 169:13 204:8 250:2 269:17 side 47:24,25 168:22 169:1,12, 20 174:17 202:23 sign 285:9 signature 6:6 signed 9:23 36:18 44:20 61:9 178:9 179:7 189:22 191:13 195:1 230:5 significant 37:22 38:9 230:16 235:17,23 248:23 similar 166:7,25 simply 134:22 248:9,16 sincere 45:22 46:6 single 129:24	slide 104:15,23 110:4,5 111:17 112:4 113:9 234:20 235:21 236:23 small 50:5 132:25 141:24 software 157:7 solid 49:19 SOP 182:16 186:3, 5 211:9,21 212:5 215:19 216:19,23, 24 217:13 218:18 227:19,20,21 228:7,8 277:1,2, 20 SOPS 13:19 84:2, 10,11 85:15 86:10 182:4,18,25 183:4 216:11 227:18 228:6 267:7,9,11, 12 268:13,17 276:17
services 31:12 111:3 115:5 195:2	shorthand 6:4	130:9 sir 163:7	sound 23:24 49:19 50:17 51:5,7,10, 16,21 52:19 53:12



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 106 of 111 July 09, 2024Index: sounds..strike

Page Dominique Delagnes

sounds 181:14 131:18 132:16 stapled 201:4 16,25 47:12 54:10 199:7 136:7 142:18 55:14,18 57:3,21 **start** 13:5 37:14 151:10 152:2,24 62:13 91:25 92:19 **source** 197:18 70:16 205:5 153:14,25 156:14 97:4 112:9 135:25 272:20 **speak** 157:19,20 178:24 179:9,11 195:12 211:14 started 15:25 206:10 223:21 220:18 227:4 speaking 54:6 70:17 123:18 246:11,19 235:14 244:14 77:23 147:23,24 144:6 254:23 257:23 161.12 spell 269:10 259:9 **starts** 35:5 126:5 special 220:1 spelling 270:4 235:12 stating 81:16 specific 162:25 **Spencer** 125:11 100:20 **state** 7:13 21:22 164:2 192:16 **spend** 13:2 190:13 22:25 74:1 87:9 **status** 221:4 216:20 229:5 98:12 100:23 238:1 266:12 **spends** 13:3,9 stayed 92:24 114:13 115:10 specifically 33:21 **spent** 15:10 150:21 153:2,5,17 step 267:21 155:24 158:17 226:7,9 230:25 **spoke** 159:22 steps 220:20,21 191:14 232:17 251:16 273:24 284:10 273:25 278:23 STIPULATED 6:1 274:21 spoken 272:6 specifics 159:3,7 stipulation 160:24 **stated** 41:22,23,25 **spring** 165:5 65:15 72:9 93:20 **specimen** 132:19 stood 119:7,8 156:3 206:12 **St** 67:9 197:6 139:10 145:18 **stop** 58:7,10 59:6, 213:23 251:5 199:3,6,10 200:12 162:15 207:16 9,23 92:14 147:6 274:20,22 281:3 270:20 271:3,5,7, **staff** 66:3 167:20 205:5 282:15 20 278:4 220:3 255:17 **stand** 81:11 statement 10:23 specimens 135:14 129:23 130:5,8,10 stopped 58:9 13:24 14:1,14,16 136:12 137:24 140:4,13,14 59:13 60:11,14 20:5,12,15 23:10 139:14 141:17 141:1,2,4 275:3 114:14,16 115:4 40:13 41:11,24 144:10 145:10,13, 279:4 280:9 117:2 55:22 68:12 79:23 21,22 155:2 156:4 standard 6:10 106:8 120:20 **stopping** 146:23 159:25 216:2 72:23 83:22 186:15 198:23 227:19,20 228:7, storage 277:14, 135:10 217:4 200:13 212:13 8,11 236:11,18 22,25 278:3,4 218:4 274:11 221:23 223:10 267:21,23,25 **Street** 8:24 236:19 246:14 268:18 standards 53:11 248:2,4 253:22 strengthen 11:4, 84:1,9,11,19 85:3, spectrometry 255:11 4,15,19,23,25 14 28:10 30:13 64:12 86:2,7,8 211:22 statements 156:25 **strike** 25:22 32:25 215:22 231:2 247:18,24 248:1, 39:2 51:14 55:6 speculation 27:23 255:5 12,23 249:22 59:2 74:15 85:5 49:4 50:10 52:1,5, 250:22 251:7,17 standing 31:15 89:6 95:22 97:9 12 75:8 86:22 252:20 253:2,5,16 129:22,23 140:7, 114:8 150:14 89:16 90:2 91:15 8,9 274:24 276:22 175:19 181:23 **states** 6:14 10:17 97:21 99:12 100:3 278:16 279:1,7 183:6 192:3 15:21 19:25 24:25 103:10 113:3 207:11 218:25 37:19,25 38:2,18, 115:22 127:14 **stands** 39:16 222:21 241:5 22,23 39:7 40:12, 128:1,12 129:15



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 107 of 111 Page! Dominiques Delagnes July 09, 2024Index: struck..telling

		Pagel Doffi 1496	5 Delagnes July 0	9, 2024Index: strucktellinç
	249:3 280:3	73:21 74:4,20	summation 176:6,	talk 22:18 23:4
	struck 255:11	77:14,19,24	8 177:7 181:6,15,	116:22 147:20
		78:10,12 79:1,6,	16 182:3 186:23	154:8 157:6,9
	subject 9:12 75:9	10 80:2,11 81:1,7,	200:19,20	159:8,12 161:21
	94:19 115:24	14 82:12,24 83:9,	Sunday 24:19	175:15
	125:14 127:16	11 87:8 97:13	42:8	talked 17:17 22:13
	133:25 174:25	99:2,4,14 103:7		44:23 84:10
	193:5 223:22 239:10 240:21	106:25 107:9,24	supplemental	117:15 159:22
	244:22 245:2,8	108:11 112:7	188:13,23 226:17	160:2,3,20 162:10
	251:3 276:16	115:12 118:10	support 18:5	212:10 218:22
		221:13 222:2	208:7	222:25 253:4
	submission 14:9	223:13 224:16	supported 174:6	261:8 270:9
	225:11	231:21,22 273:17 275:2		talking 17:10,11
	submissions		supposed 15:16 16:12 17:15 51:5,	22:5 78:4 80:4,7
	30:22 32:18	subtitle 235:6	10.12 17.13 31.3,	82:10 90:20
	221:14 223:14	successfully		100:25 102:6,8
	224:18	257:8	suppress 76:16	132:11 134:9
	submit 37:6,7,9,19	suddenly 114:10,	Supreme 96:24	138:13 144:4 145:8 157:15
	55:9 65:20 71:19	15	surprised 249:23	160:7 172:4
	72:5,16,17 191:5,	sued 172:2,12,14,	250:6	179:21 212:24
	13 225:10	19	surprising 111:4	213:15 219:17
	submitted 28:23	sufficiently	survey 191:1	237:25 238:3,5,7,
	29:1,15,22 31:23	157:10	209:17	19,23 241:12,15,
	54:4,19,25 55:25			18 254:20 276:14
	56:5 65:21 93:8 181:19 190:22	suggest 178:18 228:25 229:8	surveys 38:11 209:15	282:5 283:19
	191:22 225:9,16			talks 57:10 78:11
	231:11	suggested 183:3	suspect 20:18	177:16 182:24
		suggesting 127:8	32:3	185:20
	submitting 15:22	184:6 265:13	swear 7:5	Tammie 6:4,18
	subpoenaed 169:4	suggestions	sword 262:17	targeted 153:4
	Subsequent	178:1	sworn 7:9 273:23	team 12:11,14
	152:11	suggests 182:24	system 15:12	19:6 105:5,6
		Suite 8:25	66:19 201:8	152:12 208:8
	substance 11:5,	summaries 28:12		220:9
	18,24	173:22	systematic 209:21	Teams 66:18
	substantial 127:4,			
	22 128:25	summary 21:15,	T	tear 22:22 23:20, 22 24:8
	substantiate	16 56:16 57:6 173:14,25 174:5	table 56:24 57:13	
	63:21 127:10	200:18 235:10		Teasdale 6:17
	substantiated	243:9,14,19,24	tabular 205:11,14, 16,25 206:3	technical 194:18
	54:13,18,20,24	278:21	·	195:2
	55:3 62:17,22	summary's 57:8	taking 31:14	telling 40:3 45:18
	63:3,17 64:3	,		78:25 81:14 82:22
-1		1	1	I .



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 108 of 111

,a	.se. 4.22-cv-00070-511L	Pagel D 047.100-29	Delagnes July 09,	2024Index: temporarytime
	85:17 98:24	225:1 231:24,25	72:19 73:13 77:5	268:20 269:2
	107:7,21 123:8,14	232:3 236:11,17	79:21 93:6 111:9	276:4
	149:18 151:21	241:17 265:8	114:11 115:5	thinks 262:4
	235:20 238:8	267:3,4 270:22	117:3 123:13,14	
	260:20 261:11	271:2 279:4,8	132:22 133:15	thought 24:7
	temporary 234:22	280:7 281:12	135:8,13,16 159:4	67:21 70:4 118:25
	235:7 277:14	282:13 283:18,20	160:17 170:11,13	124:6 193:25
		284:11	172:4 227:13	221:24 224:12
	ten 21:3,9	tested 12:1 131:24	228:4 249:6	231:11 240:8
	term 119:9 139:3	228:12 271:3,5,10	264:16,17 265:2,	252:12,14 264:15
	188:4	277:8	4,6 267:6,8 268:3	thousands 29:13,
	towns 161.0		271:1 277:4,5,6	15
	terms 161:2 195:10 196:23	testified 10:14	tests 90:20 91:4	thread 124:20
		46:1 76:7 91:10	105:15 118:1,3,4,	
	210:22 211:2	95:18 148:15	14,15 121:5,7,8	125:10
	214:20 225:13	169:10	123:12 125:18,20	threshold 156:5
	276:4 277:17	testify 9:16 23:3	126:2,10,11	tied 268:13
	test 11:3,15,19	148:9 159:17	127:9,24 129:24	
	12:7 14:8 16:23	160:6 168:8 169:5	130:23,24 131:3	Tiffani 133:10
	23:19,23 24:8	170:12,13 188:9,	132:3 133:3	134:17
	26:23 37:21 47:17	12 189:3,5,7,12	136:19 137:7,21	time 6:10,11 15:11
	48:15 49:17,21	testifying 9:8	139:7,22 140:7,25	16:10,19 17:12
	56:9 70:18 72:24		141:21 144:22	18:24 33:14 36:8,
	74:6,7 76:16,21	testimony 47:2,4	170:19 198:2,23	12 45:20 48:16
	77:22 81:17,22	75:12,20 76:3,10	205:2 213:9,11	61:1,4 66:3,25
	83:2 87:20 88:17	77:15,20 79:4	236:20 267:1,14	68:2,8,13,17 70:2,
	89:13,22 90:6,17	81:8 82:10,12,13,	268:21,24 278:11	12,24,25 73:22
	91:1 96:20 98:22	22 84:23 85:16	279:18,23 280:5,	75:6 76:12 77:13,
	99:14 101:9,12	86:17,18 87:13,18	10,17 282:6,7,15,	17,22 78:6 79:9
	105:11 106:13	94:20,21 95:17,19	24	80:12 81:7,18,22
	108:1 112:12,24	117:17 152:15	TUC 25.4 2 45	85:20 94:10,13
	119:8,24 120:15	160:11 162:2,10,	THC 25:1,2,15 131:7,21 132:9	95:2,23 96:3
	125:19,25 126:11	11 165:11 168:12,	131.1,21 132.9	100:10,15,19,25
	128:17 129:7,12,	16,18,21,25	therapy 12:1	101:4,6,13,22
	18 130:5,8,10	169:11 170:4,7,25	thing 135:11	102:7 106:14,16
	132:12,20,23	172:9,16 174:7,	146:23 159:16	108:12 111:22
	133:8,12,18	15,18 198:1	160:6 171:11	114:18,20,24
	134:10,12,17,21,	251:25 273:20,23	187:20 201:6,11	115:1,2,7 117:9,
	22 137:4 140:10,	274:1,9 275:2,3	211:20 217:16	12,23 118:4 120:1
	17,21 141:3,20	278:17 279:7	236:1 277:16	121:10 122:19
	142:22 144:15,16,	testing 12:18,20	4h: 0:40 44	123:4,16 130:21
	18 145:15,20	38:5,14 49:19	things 9:12,14	138:10 158:20,24
	153:3,4 169:5,17	50:13,15,23,25	26:19 43:4,20,21 81:25 124:4	163:2 167:22
	170:10,16,17	51:1,3,5,7,10,16,		170:12 176:16,25
	191:1 204:6,16	21 52:19 55:15,	160:20 183:23	184:12,17,25
	206:15 213:6	17,18 56:6 64:13	188:23 189:12	188:17 190:14
	216:21 220:15	65:10 66:2 69:4,8	264:14 265:14,17	197:11 199:21



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 109 of 111 Page! Dominique Delagnes July 09, 2024Index: timeline..under-

200:10 229:22,25 174:4 192:22 transcript 76:2 **trusted** 115:16 254:23 256:1 193:12 196:14,15, 77:1 273:4 275:4 truth 85:17 261:11 257:3 258:3 16 197:22 198:18, transcripts turn 76:23 105:17 267:23 271:6,10, 19,21 199:20 168:15,16 12,15,20 273:16 210:16 216:25 turned 35:25 transparency 285:10 230:12 231:24 **two-day** 19:7 10:18,24 26:11, 236:3 240:7,9 timeline 105:18 13,21,22 27:1,4 241:18 246:5,6 tying 147:9 111:16 97:6 98:19 99:5 258:6,13 260:16 **type** 149:4 255:2 timely 186:9 107:3,11,25 108:3 264:15 280:20 256:8 **typed** 202:3 281:6 times 12:10 68:15 218:14 78:9 91:3 122:19 transparent 108:7 ton 171:15 140:24 168:11 115:14 116:6,15, **types** 207:16 tone 212:8 215:21 248:11,16 17,19,23,25 typical 135:3 249:23 250:1,21 top 13:2 57:22 118:16 122:13,14 typically 124:15 266:24 70:16 141:22 124:2 233:21 266:21 148:22,23 164:14 title 7:25 66:11 **tray** 145:11,12,19 167:13 182:8 typo 105:24 67:3 89:2 treat 135:20 202:19 203:7 111:25 titled 200:16 208:24 210:8 treatment 11:20 233:1,9 265:20,22 today 43:13 82:13 12:2,3,11,13,15 U 266:23 84:24 85:16 tremendous 251:6 117:22 187:17 topic 262:25 **UDC-A** 190:22 trend 204:7 188:18 255:16 263:17 191:1 209:17 213:17 214:5 272:15 total 41:13 56:14 **Uh-huh** 18:13 19:9 trends 204:5,15, **Today's** 6:9 94:4 187:23 24:12 42:6 47:7 19,21,24 205:1 53:16 54:22 **told** 19:17,21 **totally** 118:3 206:8,14,22 25:20 29:2 33:10 119:11 129:25 207:13 209:12,13, toxicologist 158:3 43:20 45:21 46:4 133:6 144:25 14 213:10,24 162:2 61:20 63:15,22 152:7 168:4 214:4,7 250:19 263:23 toxicologists 65:16 72:3,15 trial 148:9 152:15 73:3,8 74:1 77:17 161:11 269:24 270:12 159:12,17 160:7 282:4 81:13 82:25 83:9 toxicology 45:9 161:6 172:18 84:24 85:11,13 106:5 umbrella 265:9 188:9,10 86:2,13,20 96:23 umpteen 91:3 track 205:16 97:12,21 98:19 true 10:23 20:5 213:24 214:7 99:2,9,20 101:21 43:22 68:7 86:5,6, unacceptable 229:18 268:16,18 102:9 109:8 13 130:3,4 159:15 37:22 38:4.19 115:12 116:2,4 tracked 205:10,13 199:1 220:14 39:4,11,24 55:19 117:23 121:1 206:16,17 56:10,21 64:12 221:25 223:12 122:9,12 124:5 191:1 224:14 229:3 tracking 204:19 138:4 139:20 237:8,10,20 242:4 207:12 208:9 unavailable 151:8,14,16 248:9 253:5,16 160:23 152:21 153:5,10 training 216:4,22 255:23 155:15 156:9 under- 52:2 transcribed 6:5 trust 112:11 159:16 162:7



Page: 110 of 111 July 09, 2024Index: undergo..weekly Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24

Page Dominigues Delagnes **undergo** 260:19 unstable 41:20 verbiage 276:17, voluntarily 60:10, 21 277:2 13 underlined 43:24, unsubstantiated verbs 244:20 25 74:3 96:12 97:1, W 18 98:8 245:10 underlying 35:7 **untrue** 154:5 verified 43:14 understand 9:5 Wagner 80:17,20 30:7 47:22 51:12 verify 127:13,24 **update** 110:6,13 87:18,23,25 88:9 52:3,6,14 63:24 140:21 141:3 128:9,14 221:19 103:23 106:4 113:24 120:3 182:25 216:11 223:16 224:19 114:2 125:15,17 129:20,22 137:11 231:25 232:5 126:7,12 127:8 **version** 218:15 277:9 138:8 141:11 130:22 131:3,13, 234:4 143:15 147:8 16 135:19 136:9, updated 74:7 versions 177:25 149:10 155:7 11 137:3,20 138:5 92:23 93:19 131:5 158:9 169:6 172:6 139:5,20,21 versus 172:25 141:5,23,25 178:16 179:14 151:2,14 154:8 180:9 145:20 205:8 200:3 206:18 156:18 157:4 208:3 211:24 Vice 233:25 254:9. 227:17 234:15 158:7,11 159:18 212:5 216:19 18 251:9,15 253:9 161:8 162:5 270:22 277:17 256:19,20 263:8 vice.com 233:4 **Wagner's** 125:24 **updates** 183:3 283:2 video-recorded 131:22 150:17 updating 108:22 understanding 6:11 152:6 161:3 109:4,13,15 13:19 17:3 40:8 view 26:21 27:4 **Wait** 80:5 182:15 217:3 161:5 171:4 42:22 52:17 **waiting** 121:13 259:21 262:24 **upheld** 173:18 227:16 233:22 279:10,15 **wanted** 37:11 236:3 238:5,22 urinary 204:8 67:21 70:19 72:6. understood 128:3 vile 271:12 urine 72:19 135:25 8,16 93:10,13,15 191:9 223:10 vilifies 45:7 125:18 190:20,21 224:25 262:9 use/agreement 191:5,12 192:15 263:17 214:20 violated 41:17 206:15 214:6 unexpected 68:22 violating 45:10 216:11 217:19 V 47:15 **unique** 136:1 219:25 violation 47:21 unit 202:20 203:1 vague 113:3 116:9 water 133:9 49:25 65:2 215:10 164:9 167:17 134:18 263:6 violations 212:17 unite 11:4,14 website 74:24 valid 48:19 52:23 233:4 277:10 **Virginia** 8:21,25 **United** 6:13 47:11 53:12 236:10,17, week 16:17 78:25 visit 126:16 universe 199:12 20 237:23 267:5 152:12 178:12 150:21 152:11 270:25 unlike 97:5 219:16 224:11 153:8,11 154:13 validate 196:6 unquote 83:22 week-and-a-half voice 102:16 126:20 133:9 178:6 validation 28:12 212:8,12 unsatisfactory values 41:4 129:8 weekly 14:7 15:16, voices 102:23 56:15,22 57:16 21 16:15 17:16 variations 215:21 volume 169:13 72:25 210:14 175:10,16,23



Case: 4:22-cv-00878-SHL Doc. #: 106-29 Filed: 08/08/24 Page: 111 of 111 July 09, 2024Index: weeks..Zebelman

178:4 179:6.23 180:20,25 184:3 186:14 208:4 weeks 14:20 15:7 18:9,23 34:10 77:11 weight 88:1,9 welcoming 18:22 19:6 well-documented 145:9 146:15 well-written 244:24 West 8:24 Whew 67:20 whomever 161:8 220:8 widely 55:17 withheld 108:9 withholding 108:7,8 **woman** 88:13 89:13,21 90:10,17 91:12 word 30:15,17 31:14 79:14 137:9 138:24 256:6,12, 17 257:4 **worded** 244:8 words 26:4 28:4 46:8 72:8 101:3 138:9 204:23 205:3 240:11,17 241:2,6,23,24 242:1,6,8,10,16, 23 243:6 work 8:16,18,20 50:5 worked 67:8

Page Dominique Delagnes working 17:13 45:1 68:23 208:8 works 8:17 111:6 worried 70:4 **worries** 67:22 write 66:6 143:11 193:8 281:1,20 282:8,16,25 284:3 **writes** 17:3 writing 95:16 180:3 **written** 23:16 64:16 72:9 84:15 85:13 86:10 92:23 93:23 96:9 101:16 125:3 143:16 194:2 210:21 211:4 237:21 244:17 248:3,6,7 257:13 273:19 276:4 277:13 wrong 32:12 45:19 48:16 59:22 60:4 77:22 78:2 81:17, 22 83:2 88:4,7 89:13 100:10,14, 18,24 101:3,13 106:14,16 112:24 129:19 232:6 243:12 252:13 265:14 270:4 wrote 97:10 98:25

100:1 101:11 154:2 183:23 186:10,13 219:24 223:24 224:3,7, 11,15 246:1,25

Υ

year 67:14 114:9 141:21 165:23 166:1 258:25

271:18 year-and-a-half 167:24 **years** 148:23 164:23 190:12 233:15 249:6 271:16 **ves-or-no** 108:4 146:12,24 147:11 238:15 239:11 vesterday 9:8 10:3,13 18:10 19:21 43:11,20 44:10,24 45:21 46:4,7,24 61:14 96:14 201:1 265:11 270:9 York 269:21 you-all 35:24

Ζ

Zebelman 33:5 197:9 199:16 203:18 204:14 206:2 220:2,12

